



163

PREFATORY NOTE.

THE following correspondence, which has already been republished in the pages of the *Press and St. James's Chronicle*, is important, not only from the respective positions of the disputants, but as bearing directly on the disputed question, whether the Church of Rome has erred, or is (as alleged) Infallible.

Lord Redesdale contends, what can scarcely be denied, that the proof of a single error is fatal to the claim of Infallibility; and selects by way of illustration the error committed by the Church of Rome, at the Council of Constance, A.D. 1417, in directing that the cup should not be administered in the Holy Communion to the laity; whereas it is manifest, both from our Lord's own words, as recorded in Holy Scripture (St. Matthew, xxvi., 27, 28; St. Mark, xiv. 23, 24; St. Luke, xxii., 17; St. John, vi. 53, 56;) and of St. Paul (I Cor. xi., 25, 28) and even from the plain meaning of the decrees of two early Popes, LEO THE GREAT and GELASIUS I., and also from the earlier Council of Clermont, A.D. 1095, that it is the duty as well as the privilege of *all* Christians to receive the Holy Communion in *both* kinds.

It will be seen in the following pages, that while Cardinal Manning denounces the right of Private Judgment, (the great support of all educated faith), and holds it to be *treason* and *heresy* to quote ecclesiastical history, or even the words of Christ Himself as recorded in Holy Scriptures, *against* what he asserts to be the divine and infallible voice of the Church of Rome, he is himself driven, by the inexorable exigency of controversy, to refer to history, and even to historical facts of a very equivocal and doubtful character, in support of his positions. For our views, and for those of a highly valued contributor, with respect to the whole correspondence, and especially the Cardinal's last audacious letter, we refer our readers to the Appendix.

EDITOR OF PRESS AND ST. JAMES'S CHRONICLE.

THE INFALLIBLE CHURCH.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—In your paper of yesterday (8th), Cardinal Manning gives the following as the correct extract from "The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost":—"The appeal to antiquity is both a treason and heresy. It is treason because it rejects the Divine voice of the Church at this hour, and a heresy because it denies that voice to be Divine." And defends it by stating his argument to be as follows: "The appeal from the living voice of the Church to any tribunal whatsoever, human history included, is an act of private judgment and a treason, because that living voice is supreme; and to appeal from that supreme voice is also a heresy, because that voice, by Divine assistance, is infallible." He adds, "I have seen much misrepresentation of the argument, but I have never seen an answer. Unless the premisses can be refuted, no answer can be made."

I accept the challenge. The Church of Rome refuses the cup to the laity who come to her to receive the Sacrament of Christ's body and blood. I desire the Cardinal to give, if he can, prompt, separate, and explicit answers to the three following questions:—

First. Is it treason and heresy to say that history informs us that when Christ instituted that Holy Sacrament, He ordained that His blood was to be given and received through the wine as well as His body through the bread, and that all ought now to receive the Sacrament in the manner He ordained?

Second. Is it treason and heresy to say that antiquity informs us that in the time of the Apostles and long afterwards all who received that Sacrament partook of the wine as well as the bread, and that we ought all now to do as they did?

Third. When and how was the Church of Rome Divinely instructed to order what is directly contrary to what Christ Himself ordered when on earth by express words?—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

REDESDALE.

Buxton, Oct. 9.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Lord Redesdale's courteous letter in your paper of to-day is one more example in proof of the statement that my critics suppress my argument instead of answering it.

"If the voice of the Church be, by Divine assistance, infallible," then to appeal from it, to whatsoever tribunal, is to reject a Divine authority. This is clearly both treason and heresy.

What Lord Redesdale has to show is "that the voice of the Church is not, by Divine assistance, infallible." This he has

not done, nor attempted to do. I, therefore, answer his questions as follows :—

1. Our Lord ordained that the Holy Sacrament should be consecrated and received by His Apostles in both kinds; but he did not ordain that it should be received by all Christians in both kinds.

2. Communion in both kinds was in use for centuries, and is in use in some places at this day, but not as a necessary obligation by Divine commandment. We, therefore, are not all bound to Communion in both kinds.

3. The Church was Divinely instructed in all things relating to doctrine and discipline by the advent of the Spirit of Truth on the day of Pentecost, who, according to the promise of our Lord, abides for ever in the Church.

Lord Redesdale will find my proof of this truth in the book he has quoted. Until he has refuted this premiss, which my critics have always suppressed, he is only begging the question once more. I, therefore, affirm that to say, as he implies, that Communion in both kinds is necessary to all is both treason and heresy: not because it is an assertion intrinsically erroneous in itself; but because it is an assertion made in contradiction to an authority which is Divine. This point Lord Redesdale has avoided; but it is the point of my argument which he was bound to refute.—I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Archbishop.

Archbishop's House, Oct. 15.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—I thank Cardinal Manning for his reply to my letter. He tells me that I have to show "that the voice of the Church is not, by Divine assistance, infallible." I undertake to show that the voice of the Church of Rome, in refusing the cup to the laity, is false. He says that "our Lord ordained that the holy sacrament should be consecrated and received by the Apostles in both kinds; but He did not ordain that it should be received by all Christians in both kinds." I deny the last assertion.

Christ, when teaching in the Synagogue at Capernaum, said to the Jews there assembled (John vi. 53), "Except ye eat the flesh of the Son of Man, and drink His blood, ye have no life in you. Whoso eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood hath eternal life, and I will raise him up at the last day. He that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood dwelleth in Me, and I in Him." These words were not addressed to the Apostles only, but to the whole congregation. "The Jews strove among themselves, saying, 'How can this man give us his flesh to eat?' and many of His disciples said, 'This is a hard saying: who can hear it?'" All was made clear at the Last Supper, when "He gave the bread to the disciples, saying, 'Take, eat, this is My body;' and the cup, saying, 'Drink ye all of it, for this is My blood which is shed for many for the remission of sins.'" Now the Apostles did not consider that the sacrament was to be received by them only in both kinds, but by all as He had taught them. The Church of Rome alone has presumed to reject His teaching and that of His Apostles; and the Cardinal "affirms that to

say that communion in both kinds is necessary to all is both treason and heresy, not because it is an assertion necessarily erroneous in itself, but because it is made in contradiction to an authority which is Divine." He dares not to say that the order to receive in both kinds is erroneous. I defy him to show that the benefits to be received through the Holy Sacrament are promised to any who do not receive it in both kinds; and I proceed to show that the Church of Rome, in refusing the cup to the laity, cannot have done so under the guidance of the Holy Spirit, and that its authority in that matter cannot be Divine.

I freely admit that the Church has power to order in many matters; but I deny that she has power to order anything contrary to the revealed word and will of God, as the Church does in refusing the cup. How is our faith secure if what is so revealed to us is changeable? If the Church has power to set aside Christ's word in one thing, she may in another. The use of the Lord's Prayer may thus be made treason and heresy; for His order, "After this manner pray ye," is not more imperative than "Drink ye all of this." The claim to such a power is absurd and impious. God's will, so pronounced, is not changeable. St. James expressly tells us (i. 17), "Every good gift and every perfect gift is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights, with whom there is no variableness, neither shadow of turning."

The refusal of the cup is no light matter. The bread and wine are nothing except through the miraculous and mysterious agency of God, by which, through them, Christ's body and blood are given to us. His promise that "he that eateth My flesh and drinketh My blood dwelleth in Me, and I in him," is only given to those who receive both, and how can this be done except in the manner Christ ordained? The Church of Rome orders otherwise, and must be presumed to hold that hers is the better way of administering the sacrament; that Christ made a mistake in ordering all to receive it in both kinds, which an infallible Pope and his Church have corrected, thereby declaring God fallible, which is blasphemy. Their claim to have power to order contrary to what Christ ordered must rest on a denial of the infallibility of the source from which they assert that they derive their own infallibility.

I desire the Cardinal to give, if he can, a clear and explicit refutation of this reasoning.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,
Batsford Park, Oct. 20. REDESDALE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Your readers must, I fear, be weary of the subject, but I must not be so far wanting in courtesy to Lord Redesdale as not to reply to his letter. I must once more call his attention to the fact that he has both begged the question and changed it.

The question between us is simply this:—"Is it heresy to appeal from a Divine authority?" You, Sir, were clear-sighted enough to see, that appeal from a Divine Judge to any human tribunal whatsoever must be unlawful. What Lord Redesdale has to show is, "that the authority of the Church is not Divine." Instead of proving this, he has assumed it; and he then affirms

that it has erred. Let him say whether the authority of the Church be Divine or not. If it be Divine, no appeal can lie from it.

If he says that it is only human, I must ask him to read the book he has referred to, "The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost." If, after reading it, Lord Redesdale shall still say, either that the spirit of truth does not guide the Church, or that the Church, guided by the spirit of truth, can err in faith, I shall then have an answer to the question which he has hitherto begged.

On the question of the lawfulness and sufficiency of Communion "in one kind," I shall then be ready to give a full statement. But at this time it is irrelevant.

It is not relevant to say the authority of the Church is not Divine because it has ordained Communion in one kind. It can only be proved not to be Divine by the evidence proper to the question, "What is the authority with which the Divine Founder of the Church invested it?"

As I cannot ask you, Sir, to reprint a book in your columns, I must refer your readers to the work already named, in which I have given, as I believe, full and sufficient proof of my faith.—I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Archbishop.

Archbishop's House, Westminster, Oct. 22.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—In reply to Cardinal Manning, I deny that in my letter I either begged the question between us or changed it. He states it to be, "Is it heresy to appeal from a Divine authority?" and that I have to show "that the authority of the Church is not Divine." By the Church he means the Church of Rome; and I did show, and I believe successfully, that the authority of that Church in refusing the cup to the laity was not Divine. I hold the authority of Christ to be Divine, and that it is heresy to appeal from it. So far I agree with the first proposition of the Cardinal. I say that the Church of Rome appeals from that authority in refusing to give the communion in both kinds, and in doing so is heretical, and her authority not Divine. I hold, therefore, that the lawfulness of communion in one kind is strictly in point, and it was, moreover, the point distinctly raised by me in my first letter, in which I accepted the Cardinal's challenge, which he replied to, and he has no right to shirk it and say that it is irrelevant. I believe that he feels himself beaten, and wants to make the best retreat he can. The proof of a single error is fatal to the claim of infallibility.

The Cardinal may be weary of our correspondence, but I believe that your readers are not. He has made admissions which are true, important, and awkward to him—that the Apostles administered the communion in both kinds, believing of course such to be Christ's intention and order. Does he deny the authority of the Church of the Apostles to have been Divine? If it was the Church of Rome in appealing from it is, in his own showing, guilty of treason and heresy. He admits that the doctrine of communion in both kinds is not intrinsically erroneous,

but has become treason and heresy because Rome has so ruled. Treason and heresy are criminal and sinful, and thus the Cardinal admits that the claim of the Church of his adoption to infallibility has been exercised to create a new crime and sin to which poor mankind was not before subject, and which was not so in the sight of God, but which I suppose he holds that God must now recognise to be so at the dictation of Rome. This is a claim to an authority superior to Divine.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

REDESDALE,

Batsford Park, Oct. 24.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Lord Redesdale is a little too confident of victory. He has not yet put off his harness. His letter of to-day contains some matters which, I believe, on reflection he will think, as I do, to be irrelevant. I will, therefore, still confine myself to our argument. Neither Lord Redesdale, nor any man, can show that the authority of the Roman Church is not Divine because it "refuses the Cup to the laity,"—I am using his words—until he shall have first shown that the obligation to receive communion in both kinds is, by Divine commandment, imposed upon all Christians.

This he has not done.

It is not enough to quote the words of Holy Scripture until he has proved that he uses them in their true sense. Holy Scripture is Scripture only in its right sense; as a man's will is his will only so long as it is rightly interpreted. I deny Lord Redesdale's interpretation, and he has not proved it to be the true one. But he has once again begged the question, "Is this interpretation the true sense of Holy Scripture?" Till he has proved this he has done nothing.

In my first letter I pointed out that the words of institution of the Holy Sacrament were addressed, not to all Christians, but to the Apostles. They, like the command to baptise and to absolve, are a commandment to the Apostles. They commanded the Apostles to consecrate and to receive the most Holy Sacrament in both kinds. They do not command all Christians to communicate in both kinds, any more than they command all Christians to consecrate the Lord's Supper. Will Lord Redesdale affirm this latter proposition? If Lord Redesdale says that the commandment to consecrate the Holy Sacrament is given to all Christians I need make no further reply. I may leave the controversy in the hands of most of the bishops and most of the clergy of the Anglican Church. They will answer him. He must choose one of two things: The commandment is either universal or not universal. If he say it is universal as to Communion he must show how it is not also universal as to Consecration. If he say it is not universal as to Consecration he must show that of which he has not shown the shadow of a proof, namely, how it is an universal command as to Communion.

I reject Lord Redesdale's interpretation of Scripture; and in quoting this text he is simply begging the question, "Is this the true sense of Scripture?"

Finally, Lord Redesdale says, "I hold the authority of Christ

to be Divine, and that it is heresy to appeal from it. So far I agree with the Cardinal."

I have nowhere said anything so needless. I said "the authority of the Church is Divine." And that proposition Lord Redesdale cannot disprove except by refuting its proper evidence. He does not advance his argument a single point by reiterating the quotations from Scripture about communion. The Sacramentarians would quote against Lord Redesdale the same words that he quotes against me, and would tell him that they are "the authority of Christ" to prove that the bread and wine are merely figures.

As I said in my last letter, Lord Redesdale has to show one of two things—"Either that the Church is not guided by the Spirit of Truth, or that the Church guided by the Spirit of Truth can err in faith."

I have affirmed its authority to be Divine because it is guided by the Spirit of Truth; and that, for that same reason, to appeal from its authority is heresy. I have also referred Lord Redesdale to the proper evidence of this assertion. Let him refute it. All else is, I do not think it becoming to say "shirking," but beating the air.—I remain, Sir, your obedient servant,

HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Archbishop.

Archbishop's House, Oct. 27.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—The Cardinal's reply to my last letter is that he denies my interpretation of Scripture, and that I have not proved it to be true. I say the same of his interpretation, and in doing so do not beg the question more than he does. It is for those who read our correspondence, and who have common sense and common fairness, to determine which of us has the best of the argument.

The Cardinal, in support of his interpretation, gives the authority of the Church of Rome. In support of mine, I give that of Christ and of the Church of the Apostles.

He says that Christ did not order Communion in both kinds to be received by all Christians. I refer him to the passages quoted in my letter of the 20th, from the sixth chapter of St. John's Gospel, in which Christ, speaking not to the Apostles only, but to all in the synagogue at Capernaum, in three separate sentences repeated and confined the benefits to be obtained through the Sacrament He afterwards instituted to those who partook of His body and blood. It is no answer to say that the Sacramentarians would quote those words to prove that the bread and wine are merely figures. Does he so interpret them?

The Cardinal holds that Christ, in instituting the Sacrament of the Last Supper, "commanded the Apostles, in the words used by Him, to consecrate and receive it in both kinds, but did not command all Christians so to communicate." He begs the question here, but does not prove it. He says that "the commandment is either universal or not universal, and that if I say it is universal as to Communion I must show how it is not universal as to Consecration." I say that there is no order whatever in His words about consecration—no command in them

to do anything to others as in those relating to Baptism. They are universal, and were addressed to the Apostles as recipients only. In giving them the cup He connected the remission of sins most particularly with the shedding of His blood, which makes that part of the Sacrament at least as important to the common recipient as to the clerical celebrant. That the Apostles so understood the order and acted upon it is certain. Indeed the Cardinal says, in his letter of the 15th: "Communion in both kinds was in use for centuries," thus admitting that it was in accordance with the doctrine and discipline of the Church of the Apostles. He has not replied to my questions—First, whether that Church, having been, as he says in the same letter, "Divinely instructed in all things relating to doctrine and discipline by the advent of the Spirit of Truth on the Day of Pentecost," had not Divine authority: and, secondly, whether the Church of Rome ordering the contrary to the doctrine and discipline so established was not, according to the principles on which he rests his arguments, guilty of treason and heresy. I repeat that, in the refusal of Communion in both kinds, the Church of Rome has not been guided by the Spirit of Truth, and that the Church of the Apostles, which ordained otherwise, was. Both cannot be right. The Cardinal admits that Communion in both kinds is not intrinsically erroneous. Then why has Rome forbidden it? A good reason is required, and he does not suggest any.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

REDESDALE.

Batsford Park, Moreton-in-March, Oct. 28.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Lord Redesdale asks me to give the reason why the Catholic Church has ordered communion in one kind only to be received by all, whether priests or lay people, excepting only the celebrating priest. This I am most willing to do. But I must forewarn him that, if he shall say that the Catholic Church is wrong in its interpretation of Holy Scripture—which would be assuming, without saying it, that he is right—he must bear with me if I still repeat, first, that he is begging the question, "Which of the two interpreters cannot err?" and, secondly, that, instead of showing that the evidence given, in the book so often named, to "prove that the Catholic Church is guided always by the Spirit of Truth," is insufficient, he has proposed to me to discuss "communion in one kind." I must therefore say again that he has changed the question. But I am very willing for the present to follow him.

The main reason why the Catholic Church ordered communion in one kind is given in the Catechism of the Council of Trent. It was to eradicate the heresy of those who denied that the presence of Christ is whole and perfect under either kind. They affirmed that the body alone, without the blood (*corpus exsangue*), is present under the form of bread, and the blood alone under the form of wine. This was a gross, earthly, and carnal conception, like that of the people of Capharnaum. The Church, in the Councils of Constance and of Trent, therefore condemned it, and declared that in either kind was contained the whole and undivided presence of Christ. The practice of com-

munion in one kind was enjoined to test the faith of those who received it.

For the same reason, in the time of the Manichean heresy, Pope Gelasius and Pope Leo I. ordered that none should be admitted to communion who would not communicate in both kinds. The Manicheans refused the chalice because they taught that wine came from an evil principle. Communion in both kinds detected them.

The doctrine of the Church on this subject is as follows:—
“There is no Divine commandment nor any intrinsic necessity that all men should receive communion in both kinds.”

1. First, there is no Divine commandment. The argument in my last letter is still unanswered. The words of our Lord are a command to the apostles and to their successors only. The consecration in both kinds, and the consuming of both, are necessary to the sacrifice of Christ, continued and represented in the sacrament of His body and blood. The priest who consecrates receives both. Not as if both were necessary to communion, but because the consuming of both is necessary to the sacrifice.

2. Secondly, there is no intrinsic necessity to receive both. Communion in either is full and perfect. The words of our Lord in St. John prove this, and disprove the interpretation of Lord Redesdale. Our Lord says, in three places: “I am the living bread. . . . If any man shall eat of this bread, he shall live for ever” (chap. vi., 51, 52). “Again: “The bread which I will give is my flesh for the life of the world” (v. 52); and again: “He that eateth this bread shall live for ever” (v. 59). Lastly: “As the living Father hath sent Me, and I live by the Father, so he that eateth Me, the same shall also live by Me” (v. 58); that is, “as I am consubstantial with the Father as God, they that eat Me shall be consubstantial with Me as man.” “He that eateth Me, in that one act partakes both of the body and of the blood; and he that eateth this bread eateth Me.” It is a gross, earthly, and carnal error to suppose that communion is divided, or that each of the two kinds contain severally that which is not present in the other.

Lord Redesdale strangely imagines that I make a concession in saying that communion in both kinds was long in practice, and is still in practice in some places at this day. Throughout the whole of those ages communion was given also in one kind to the sick, to those who were in prison, to households in time of persecution, and in other circumstances of necessity. Even the Greek Church at this day gives communion to the sick in one kind only.

Now I have made this answer simply out of courtesy. Lord Redesdale says that in denying his interpretation of Holy Scripture I beg the question as much as he does. Let us try this comparison. I deny that our Lord's words bind all Christians to receive in both kinds. The whole Catholic Church at least denies it with me, and, I might add, the Greek Church also.

Lord Redesdale denies that our Lord's words are a command to consecrate the Lord's Supper. I shall be curious to see who share with him in this denial. Not the Lutherans, who hold consubstantiation. Not the genuine Calvinists, for they hold a

real presence. Not the Anglicans, from Bishop Andrews to Bishop Wilson, for they profusely believed in the act of consecration. Not, I think—though I have my fears—the pious and reverent Evangelical clergy, for they somehow believe the Communion Service. Lord Redesdale will find himself, I think, in a scant and ill-sorted company.

Be so good as to observe that I say nothing of the promise that the Spirit of Truth shall abide with the Church for ever. This was our thesis at first, but for Lord Redesdale's sake we have left it.

Lastly, I must not omit to add that we are not on equal terms; Lord Redesdale has the advantage of me. He knows precisely what I hold, for the Council of Trent tells him. I do not at all know what he holds, for the Church of England does not tell me. Negatively I can gather that he does not hold transubstantiation, for the Thirty-nine Articles expressly reject it. But positively I can have no knowledge. I know what Bishop Andrews held, for he said, "Take away your transubstantiation, and we have no quarrel with your sacrifice;" and I think I know what the Sacramentarian Churchmen hold, but between these two distant regions I do not know where Lord Redesdale may be. His former letters give little sign; his last gives less. The most definite passage seems to be that in which he denies that in the Lord's Supper there is any consecration, but only a universal command to receive. To receive what?

But, as I said; I leave this to the bishops and clergy of his own Church.—I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Archbishop.

Archbishop's House, Oct. 30.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—The Cardinal, by a long letter and wilful misrepresentations, evades answering the vital questions I put to him in my last letter. He says I change the original questions between us by discussing Communion in one kind. In my first letter I accepted his challenge, that the voice of the Church of Rome was Divine, and that to appeal from it was treason and heresy, by asking the following questions:

First. Is it treason and heresy to say that history informs us that when Christ instituted the Holy Sacrament He ordained that His blood was to be given and received through the wine as well as His body through the bread, and that all ought now to receive the Sacrament in the manner He ordained?

Second. Is it treason and heresy to say that antiquity informs us that in the time of the Apostles, and long afterwards, all who received the Sacrament partook of the wine as well as the bread, and that we ought all now to do as they did?

How can the Cardinal dare to charge me with changing the question in discussing Communion in one kind? I purposely confined the discussion to one point, it being possible to bring that to a conclusion in a newspaper correspondence, and the proof of a single error is fatal to the claim of infallibility. He wants to shift me into a general criticism of his book.

I do not avoid meeting him on his question as to the voice of

the Church being Divine. On the contrary, I asked him whether the Church of the Apostles, being Divinely instructed in all things pertaining to doctrine and discipline by the advent of the Spirit of Truth on the Day of Pentecost, had not Divine authority? He gives no answer to that question, nor to the one which followed, Whether the Church of Rome ordering contrary to the doctrine and discipline of the Church of the Apostles in relation to Communion in both kinds was not, according to the principles on which he rests his argument, guilty of treason and heresy? Where is there any change of the question between us in these questions, and why no answers?

I now, most unwillingly, occupy the time of those who read this correspondence by noting some of his other mis-statements. He says that "for my sake" (What does he mean except to confuse our readers?) he says nothing of the Spirit of Truth abiding in the Church for ever. I quote the whole passage from St. Matthew xxviii. 19-20, because it supports my argument. "Go ye and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost: teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you: and, lo, I am with you alway, even unto the end of the world." The promise is conditional on their teaching all things whatsoever that He had commanded. He is not with them if they teach otherwise.

He says that I deny that our Lord's words are a command to consecrate the Lord's Supper. This misrepresents my argument. Our Lord on that occasion consecrated the elements Himself, and what I said was that His words were addressed to the Apostles as recipients. Consecrating by them before giving was no doubt intended, but it was not expressed, and the Church of the Apostles ordered accordingly, to prevent abuses mentioned by St. Paul in 1 Cor. xi. The argument as to His words being an instruction to consecrate, with power to omit either element in communicating, is as good for omitting the bread as the wine, and the Cardinal says, "There is no intrinsic necessity in receiving both. Communion in either is full and perfect." Where does he find that this was ever practised in wine only? And why, if this is so, is consuming both necessary to the Consecration and not to the Communion? When he quotes bread only being mentioned in John vi., it is where Christ was showing that the manna was typical of Him. Where He indicates the manner in which the Sacrament was to be thereafter ordained, He expressly unites flesh and blood. The examples he gives of Communion in one kind may be as the Cardinal states. I have not his learning in those matters, but they are all in bread, and, being all exceptional cases, they prove the general rule.

I must now notice the reason given by the Cardinal for the Church of Rome refusing the cup to communicants, which was ordered at the Council of Constance, in 1417. He says it was because some persons denied that the presence of Christ was whole and perfect under either kind. Therefore, in consequence of a doctrinal controversy, all recipients were, contrary to the doctrine and discipline Divinely ordered by the Church of the Apostles, and acted upon for fourteen centuries, to be for ever

deprived of the privilege of receiving in both kinds. Is it possible to conceive a weaker reason, or, I may add, a more wicked one? By this order, as I remarked in a former letter (which has not been answered), an act which the Cardinal admits was not intrinsically erroneous, was made a new crime and sin by the Church of Rome, which thereby ordered God to consider an act sanctioned by Christ to be thenceforth at Rome's dictation deserving the severest punishment. I said that this was a claim to an authority superior to Divine. What else is it? Let the Cardinal reply.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Batsford Park, Nov. 2.

REDESDALE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—I see with sincere regret that I have unconsciously given Lord Redesdale pain. Some of his words I indeed thought a little too free, and it seemed to me not amiss that he should be sensible of it. But I have too much respect for him to forget what is due to him and to myself; and I hope I may add that his letters may be misunderstood without wilful misunderstanding. Henceforth I will treat of the subject he has proposed without reference to himself.

It is self-evident that if the Catholic Church can be convicted of violating a Divine commandment it cannot, in that at least, be guided by the Spirit of Truth; and if it can be shown that communion in both kinds is enjoined upon all the faithful by a Divine commandment, the Catholic Church, in decreeing communion in one kind, would have violated a Divine commandment. A.F.P.

It rests upon those who make this charge to prove that such a Divine commandment exists. Not a shadow of such a proof has as yet been made.

I. The words of institution by our Divine Saviour contain no such Divine commandment. He consecrated bread and wine. He commanded the apostles to do the same in commemoration of Him. He commanded them both to eat and drink that which He consecrated. When our Lord commanded His disciples to baptise all nations, He gave a Divine commission to be executed and regulated in its exercise by the apostles and their successors. The obligation to receive baptism is distinct from the commission to baptise. In like manner, when our Lord breathed upon His apostles, He gave them power, and a commandment to remit or to retain the sins of men. The obligation to receive such absolution is wholly distinct from the commission to absolve, and is not here expressed.

In these three commandments or commissions there is not a word as to the mode of receiving communion, or baptism, or absolution. The Council of Trent defines that, in the command to consecrate, our Divine Lord communicated to the apostles a share in His own priesthood. There is not, in the quotations which have hitherto been introduced into this correspondence from the New Testament, a word to prove a universal obligation laid upon all the faithful to communicate in both kinds. They abundantly, indeed, prove that the practice of communion in both kinds existed. But this nobody denies. What is denied,

and what must be proved, is that this practice was by Divine commandment. It was at that day the practice to baptise by immersion. There are those who still say that baptism by immersion is a Divine commandment. By what authority, then, was baptism by affusion introduced throughout the Church? By the same authority which introduced communion in one kind.

II. We will now go on to see whether the practice of communion in both kinds imposes any obligation whatsoever upon all the faithful. Again, it is for those who affirm it to make good their assertion. Nevertheless, I will give evidence to show that, from the earliest traceable records, it is proved that the practice of communion in both kinds, and the practice of communion in one kind, existed simultaneously and ran on side by side.

Dr. Döllinger, whose weight will probably be greater with some for the same reasons which with us make it to be less, in his "History of the Church" says: "The blessed Eucharist was ordinarily administered to the faithful in the ancient Church under both forms of bread and wine; and there never was a doubt that the substance of the sacrament was contained entire under either form; or that he who received under either form received a perfect sacrament." . . . "Communion under one form was . . . frequent in the ancient Church; perhaps more frequent than communion under both forms. For domestic communion, in which the faithful partook only of the consecrated bread, which they had taken with them to their houses, was, particularly in times of persecution, of more ordinary occurrence than communion in the Church." Of this there is evidence in Tertullian, as early as about the year A.D. 200. Dr. Döllinger adds that the anchorets in the wilderness communicated only in one kind. So also the sick. He gives the example of Serapion, and of St. Ambrose, who, when dying, received in one kind only at the hands of the Bishop Honoratus. This was in A.D. 397. He adds the practice of the Greek Church, in which during Lent communion was given five days in the week in one kind only. ("History of the Church," vol. 2, 323—325; translation by Dr. Cox.)

I may refer to another book equally accessible, the "Hierurgia" of Dr. Rock. He says, "So far . . . is the Greek Church from considering communion under the two species as essential to the integrity of the sacrament that during the whole of Lent, except on Saturdays and Sundays and the Feast of the Annunciation, the Mass, as it is called, of the Presanctified—i.e., in which there is no consecration—is alone permitted. . . . Consequently the Greek priest who offers up the mass, as well as those amongst the laity . . . take the holy communion under one kind only—that of bread." Moreover, in the Greek Church, the Viaticum, or Eucharist given to the dying, is administered on all occasions, and at every season of the year, under the sole form of bread alone. The same is the practice of the Maronites and other Oriental Christians." He further asserts that this practice came from the time of the apostles, and quotes evidence from the second and third centuries. ("Hierurgia," vol. i., pp. 273—282.)

To this I may add two cases of communion in one kind only which are mentioned by Venerable Bede in his "History of the

Anglo-Saxon Church," in the 14th and 24th chapters of the Fourth Book—that is, in the century after the restoration of Christianity in England. Is it possible that such facts could be mentioned without reproof, if there were a Divine command to receive in both kinds? Objectors have to disprove these facts, public and authoritative, sanctioned by the earliest ages, by the greatest saints, and by the practice of the whole Church, East and West, before they can venture to affirm, on their private interpretation of Scripture, that there is a Divine command to receive in both kinds.

Communion in both kinds and communion in one kind were alike in practice and in the same ages and places throughout the Church, and, as we have seen, the ages nearest to the apostles, which is an historical demonstration that neither any Divine command nor any intrinsic necessity for communion in both kinds was ever believed to exist. The error is modern, and sprang from two roots—a carnal doctrine about the real presence, and private interpretation of Holy Scriptures.

III. I will now repeat the answer given in my first letter as to the authority by which communion in one kind was ordered. It was by the Divine authority of the Church, guided by the Spirit of Truth, the sole witness, teacher, and judge as to what commandments are Divine, and how far they extend.

In the question before us, the Church from the beginning—and, to preclude objection, I will add, before the division of East and West—taught that no Divine commandment existed binding all the faithful to communion in both kinds; and it sanctioned, as the facts above cited prove, the practice of communion in one kind only. There was in this no claim to an authority superior to a Divine commandment. No such commandment in this case existed. The Church had, and it exercised, a Divine authority to declare what commandments were Divine, and what was the extent of their obligation. I found this assertion upon the passage to which I am referred, St. Matthew xxviii. 19, 20, by which the following truths are proved:—

1. That our Lord constituted the apostles to be the teachers of all nations.

2. That He commanded the apostles to baptise those who believed in the unity of the faith.

3. That He committed to the apostles the custody of His commandments, and made them to be the teachers and the interpreters of the same.

4. That He promised His own abiding presence with the apostles, and with those who bear the apostolic office until the end of the world.

This, in my judgment, will be sufficient to prove that the Church has a Divine authority to declare what are the commandments committed to it, and that to appeal from its Divine voice in such declarations is resistance to a supreme authority, and therefore treason, and a rejection of a Divine authority, and therefore heresy. But these are no new crimes, newly invented; they are the moral obliquities of unbelief, as old as the Divine authority against which they offend.

But we have not yet stated the full proof of this Divine authority of the Church. After our Divine Lord had given this

commission to His apostles, and constituted them the witnesses and teachers of His commandments—and, I must add, the sole fountain of His supreme jurisdiction in the world—He commanded them not to depart from Jerusalem until they should be endued with power from on high (Acts i. 4, 5). He had said to them before His Passion, “It is expedient for you that I go, for if I go not the Paraclete will not come to you; but if I go, I will send Him to you” (St. John, xvi. 7). And again: “I will ask the Father, and He will give to you another Paraclete, that He may abide with you for ever” (xiv. 16). From these words of our Divine Lord it may be affirmed:—

1. That when He ascended to the Father, the Holy Ghost personally came as another Paraclete in His stead.

2. That the mission of the Son into the world ended at His ascension; but that the personal presence of the Holy Ghost in His stead abides for ever.

3. That the Paraclete came, according to His promise, upon the apostles, and upon the Church which they founded throughout the world.

4. That the Paraclete, or the Spirit of Truth, abides still in the Church of all nations which alone is spread throughout the world.

For these reasons I affirm the authority of that Church to be Divine, and all appeals *from* its authority in matters of faith to be what I will not repeat. Finally, once more to preclude objections, I will add that this one Church of all nations was from the beginning in communion with its centre at Rome; that it is so at this moment; that the Church is therefore both Catholic and Roman; that “the Catholic Church” and “the Roman Church” are coincident titles and realities; and that its authority as a teacher rests upon the promise of its Divine Head, and upon the abiding presence of the Spirit of Truth.—I remain, Sir, your faithful servant, .

HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Archbishop.

Archbishop's House, S.W., Nov. 3.

TO THE EDITOR OF “THE DAILY TELEGRAPH.”

SIR,—I thank the Cardinal for the handsome manner in which he expresses his regret for having given me pain. I certainly was annoyed at being told more than once that I was changing the question between us, when I was most careful in strictly adhering to it, and it was my policy to do so.

He does not answer my questions, but writes a very long letter. In mine of the 24th October I thought he was getting weary of the correspondence, which he felt was going against him. I am inclined to think that he is now disposed so to lengthen it that many may be deterred from reading it when all may be published together. I cannot allow my purpose to be so defeated.

I will, however, reply to his remarks. He calls on me to show that there is a Divine command to communicate in both kinds. My answer is that Christ instituted both kinds, that both were given on the same occasion, both in the same words, and both ordered by Him to be done in remembrance of Him. It is for the Cardinal to show that anything said or done by Christ on

that occasion authorised the omission of either, or the sufficiency of one without the other. It is a simple question to ask, but a difficult one for him to answer. Why did Christ institute two kinds, if one was enough, and if he did not intend both to be used?

But I further refer him to the doctrine and discipline of the Church in the time of the apostles. There can be no doubt that they communicated in both kinds. The words of St. Paul, in 1 Cor. xi., are conclusive on the point, and he there tells the whole Christian congregation at Corinth that he had received that doctrine of the Lord which he delivered to them. This is something like a Divine command. The Apostles did not want a council to confirm their orders, and what was the practice of the Church in their days and for long years after must be held to have been by Divine authority.

The Cardinal's argument must be that there was no Divine command on the subject until what he considers such was given at the Council of Constance, about fourteen centuries after the institution of the Sacrament. He will, I suppose, admit that there was a Divine command to communicate. How was it given except in the words "Do this in remembrance of Me," used separately and similarly in giving the wine and the bread?

The Cardinal quotes several instances from history of communion in one kind only. Probably it began in the days of persecution, when the prison rules did not allow wine to be brought to those confined therein, and a mutilated sacrament in bread alone was all that could be given, for which there was some reason. I defy the Cardinal to show any Divine authority for communion in one kind only, and it must be a sore matter for him to be obliged to go to history to find an excuse for it, after what he has said of such an appeal. They are all exceptional cases, and, like all things of that character, went on growing by degrees, and, doctrinal controversy arising on the question, the Church of Rome resolved to settle it their own way, by refusing to allow communion in both kinds, thus prohibiting what Christ directed, what the apostles followed, and the Church had accepted as the general rule for centuries, and I say that in doing so the Church of Rome was disobedient, and, according to the Cardinal, guilty, consequently, of treason and heresy.

I have now supported and repeated my two first questions; and, in treating of the third, I am disposed to place the Pope in a ridiculous position, as I have known an argument of that sort to be felt and understood when more sober reasoning has not been attended to. Let us suppose that God was to allow St. Peter to return to earth for a short time, and that the saint was to go to Rome, and, entering a church there, was to administer the Holy Sacrament in both kinds, as he had been accustomed to do up to the time of his martyrdom, believing such to have been Christ's order and intention. According to the Cardinal, it would be the duty of the infallible Pope Pius IX., who pretends to be the successor and representative of St. Peter, to denounce the venerable apostle as a traitor and a heretic. Would not he say to the Pontiff, "This is a new thing to tell me that I am guilty of a crime in doing that which my Lord and Master told me to do in remembrance of Him? Do you claim to be superior

to Christ?" I think Pope Pius would be puzzled to find an answer.

I now close this correspondence on my part. I have allowed the Cardinal plenty of opportunity for reply to my arguments, which I believe have been generally accepted, by those who are allowed to exercise their common sense in determining such things, as showing that the Church of Rome is in error in prohibiting communion in both kinds, and consequently in doing so has not been guided by the Spirit of Truth. I know that the proof of a single error is fatal to the claim of infallibility, and I am satisfied.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant, REDESDALE.

Batsford Park, Nov. 4.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Lord Redesdale says he has closed this correspondence on his part. I hold it to be a sound rule to be the last to begin a contention, and the last to leave off. I did not begin this correspondence. And neither on the 24th of October, nor in my last letter, did I give any sign of desiring to close it. My object is, not to gain a victory over Lord Redesdale, but to vindicate the Divine authority of the Catholic Church from an imputation of having erred.

Let us, however, now sum up. Lord Redesdale's whole argument consists in this. He says the Church has erred. To prove this he quotes a text; and he interprets that text of Scripture in a sense at variance with the interpretation held by the whole Church, Greek and Latin, East and West; and confirmed, as I have shown, by the traceable practice of the Church running up to the second century, and sanctioned by the judgment and the example of the greatest names of the Christian world.

The immemorial practice of communion in one kind is not to be disposed of by talking of persecution, or of "exceptional cases." Its antiquity and widespread use prove beyond contention two things:—Firstly: That the words of our Lord in instituting the Holy Sacrament contained no Divine commandment imposing upon all the faithful to receive in both kinds; and, secondly, that, to the full integrity of communion, it was held to be absolutely indifferent whether communion was received in both kinds or in one alone. A "mutilated sacrament"—as Lord Redesdale called it—would be a sacrilege, both in the giver and receiver. Were the early Christians in the East and West habitually sacrilegious? Did St. Ambrose on his death-bed receive a "mutilated" sacrament? Did he make a sacrilegious communion before appearing in the presence of his Lord? Would he have listened to Lord Redesdale if he had stood by his dying bed to inculcate the doctrine contained in his letters? We must believe either Lord Redesdale or St. Ambrose; and I am content to leave this issue to the judgment of common sense, to which Lord Redesdale has appealed.

I have said from the beginning that the whole of this correspondence is a begging of the question.

Not one hair's-breadth beyond this has Lord Redesdale advanced his argument.

Lord Redesdale can claim for his interpretation of the words

of Scripture no higher certainty and no higher authority than his own, and the authority of those, be they few or many, who proceed, as he does, on the same principle of private opinion. The certainty and authority upon which I rely for the interpretation that I have given, is the authority of the Catholic Church, which, as I proved in the close of my last letter by the full and plain words of our Lord Himself, is preserved always from error in faith by the perpetual presence and assistance of the Spirit of Truth. This was my original thesis; and against this not one relevant argument has hitherto been directed.—I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Archbishop.

Archbishop's House, Nov. 6.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—In my late correspondence with Cardinal Manning I purposely rested my argument on Scripture alone, knowing that for so testing the truth of any doctrine I had the authority of St. Luke, who praised the Beræns (Acts xvii. 11) for searching the Scriptures daily whether those things which St. Paul preached to them were so. The Church of Rome discourages such inquiry, but I prefer St. Luke's advice to the Pope's.

The Cardinal, in advocating communion in one kind, supported his interpretation of Christ's words in instituting the Holy Sacrament, which is not in accordance with their plain meaning, by reference to human history only, not finding anything that he could call Divine authority for communion in one kind before the Council of Constance in 1415. He tried to tempt me into a discussion on that class of evidence, which, if I had entered into, might have been endless. His statements have been extensively contradicted in regard to the doctrine of the Eastern Church and other matters, but no one can be surprised at his declining to enter into controversy with anonymous writers in various papers. There is, however, one point on which the contradiction is of such a character that he may desire to notice it, and I therefore think it fair to him to give him the opportunity of doing so if so inclined.

In his letter of October 30, he said:—"In the time of the Manichean heresy Pope Gelasius and Pope Leo I. ordered that none should be admitted to communion who would not communicate in both kinds. The Manicheans refused the chalice because they taught that wine came from an evil principle. Communion in both kinds detected them."

The inference which the Cardinal apparently desired to be drawn from this statement is that those Popes held that communion in either kind was complete, and that they only ordered the cup to be given to expose the Manicheans. Leo I., generally known as Leo the Great, was Pope from 440 to 461. In treating of the Manicheans he wrote:—"They refuse the sacrament of our salvation (*abdicant se Sacramento*); with unworthy mouth they receive Christ's body, but altogether decline to drink the blood of our redemption." Can anyone doubt, after reading the above words, that he considered receiving the bread only in regular communion was no sacrament?

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—I must again refer Lord Redesdale to the works I have quoted on the interpretation of the words of St. Leo and St. Gelasius. Lord Redesdale was quite right in his former letter in saying that such discussions are endless. I am happy to see that he agrees with me in thinking that the Divine Author of Christianity did not leave us to find the way of salvation in such interminable paths.

The Council of Constance did not say, "Though Christ after supper instituted and administered to His disciples in both kinds of bread and wine this venerable Sacrament, &c., we, the Council, decree otherwise." It condemns as rash, and therefore as false, the assertion that communion in both kinds is necessary. Then it goes on to declare that communion in one kind only is sufficient.

The Council of Constance expressly says that the institution and administration in both kinds to the Apostles imposes no Divine command upon all the faithful. This is what Lord Redesdale affirms and the Council denies. Lord Redesdale has read the Council into his own sense, which the Council expressly condemns as "rash" and as erroneous.

Lord Redesdale might have seen this to have been the meaning if he had attended to the words at the beginning of the Decree, which run as follows:—"Whereas in some parts of the world certain men rashly presume to assert that Christian people ought to receive the Holy Sacrament of the Eucharist under both kinds," &c. The meaning of the Council is what I have affirmed from the beginning: that no such Divine command exists, and therefore, the Divine authority of the Church, for just and sufficient reasons, has declared communion in one kind to be sufficient, as it has also declared the sufficiency of baptism by affusion.

I am happy to see Lord Redesdale and I are now agreed on the point that to appeal from a Divine authority to human history is treason and heresy.

Lord Redesdale recognises Divine authority only in Holy Scripture. I affirm the Divine authority to exist in the perpetual presence and perpetual assistance of the same Spirit of Truth by whose guidance those Scriptures were written, and in the interpretation of which He cannot contradict Himself.

If Lord Redesdale denies this proposition, on what basis higher than human history does he rest his belief of the inspiration and Canon of Scripture itself? We believe the authority upon which we receive the inspiration and Canons of Scripture to be, like the books themselves, Divine.—I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Archbishop.

Dec. 2.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—The Cardinal again refers me to the works of others for his interpretation of the words of Popes Leo and Gelasius. I have given to their words their only plain meaning; and I consider it unnecessary to inquire how those who dislike their plain meaning endeavour to interpret them otherwise.

I desire now to refer to the following statement made by the Cardinal in his letter of Nov. 6th as to the reception of communion in one kind by St. Ambrose on his deathbed, to which he again refers in his letter of Nov. 28th :—" Did St. Ambrose on his deathbed receive a mutilated sacrament? Did he make a sacrilegious communion before appearing in the presence of his Lord? Would he have listened to Lord Redesdale if he had stood by his dying bed to inculcate the doctrine contained in his letters? We must believe either Lord Redesdale or St. Ambrose, and I am content to leave this issue to the judgment of common sense to which Lord Redesdale has appealed." It is possible that the Cardinal, with the information he must have had to enable him to make this statement, was not aware of this fact to which I now direct the attention of your readers: It is recorded by Paulinus that as soon as the Bishop of Vercelli had administered to St. Ambrose the Body of the Lord, and the holy man had swallowed it, he forthwith expired. There was not time, therefore, for him to receive the cup.

The Cardinal allows all that I can desire in regard to the acts of the Council of Constance: that they acknowledged that Christ instituted and administered the Sacrament in both kinds; and that, admitting this, they declared that no Divine command was thereby imposed on the faithful; that to assert that it ought to be received as Christ instituted and administered it was rash and erroneous, and that it should be thenceforth administered in one kind only. Christ said, separately, in giving the bread and the cup, " Eat this in remembrance of Me," and " Drink this in remembrance of Me." What can be a Divine command if these words are not so? and particularly as it is known, and the Cardinal admits, that the Apostles, who were the inspired interpreters of their Lord's meaning, administered in both kinds. It is useless to continue to argue with one who evades answering plain questions. I now ask the Cardinal once more to show that there is anything in Christ's words which can be held to authorise the omission of either kind, or the sufficiency of the one without the other; and why He instituted two kinds if one was enough, and if He did not intend both to be received. If he cannot do this, it is useless to continue further argument on the point. He may hold, though he cannot show it, that the Church of Rome, which was the only Church represented at the Council of Constance, acted under Divine guidance in declaring that Christ did not mean what He said, and that His words were not a Divine command. I cannot; and no other branch of the Catholic Church assents to the finding of the Church of Rome in the matter, and I am content so to close our controversy.

An objection has been taken by another correspondent in your paper of to-day to my quoting in my letter of the 28th November St. Luke's approval of the Berean Jew searching the Scriptures to test the truth of St. Paul's teaching from them that " Christ must have suffered and risen from the dead, and that this Jesus which he preached to them was Christ," as an authority for Christians testing from their Scriptures the teaching of the Church of Rome, because the Scriptures which St. Luke praised the Bereans for searching were those of the Old Testament, and not of the New. St. Paul's arguments were drawn

from the Old Testament, and were to be tested by searching it. How can it be held that the same advice does not apply to searching the New Testament in relation to communion in both kinds for what Christ and the Apostles said and did in relation to it? St. Luke, in his preface to his Gospel, says (c. i., v. 3, 4): "It seemed good to me, having had a perfect understanding of all things from the very first, to write unto thee, in order, most excellent Theophilus, that thou mightest know the certainty of those things wherein thou hast been instructed." Did not St. Luke mean that Christians should seek certainty in matters of doctrine by searching the gospel which he wrote for that purpose?—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

REDESDALE.

Batsford Park, Dec. 3.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—Lord Redesdale will not be surprised if I confide in the interpretation unanimously put by Catholic theologians on the words of St. Leo and St. Gelasius, rather than in an interpretation which rests on his authority. And I therefore refer your readers to the works I have already quoted.

As to the case of St. Ambrosé, if all that Lord Redesdale can offer is the supposition that there was not "time" to administer the "cup," the controversy is indeed closed. I have again and again given proof that communion in one kind was from the earliest traceable antiquity administered in private in one kind only, and have given evidence reaching from the second century to the seventh. This practice is absolute proof of two conclusions:

1. That no one believed the words of institution by our Divine Lord to impose a commandment upon all the faithful to receive in both kinds; and,

2. That communion in one kind was believed to be full and sufficient communion in the Holy Sacrament.

Once more I refer your readers to the evidence given by Dr. Dollinger and Dr. Rock, whose works are accessible to every one.

Lastly, as to the Council of Constance, I have again to say that it expressly condemns Lord Redesdale's position as "rash," and therefore erroneous.

It distinguishes, as I have done throughout this correspondence, between the institution of the Holy Sacrament and the communion of the faithful. It asserts, as I have asserted in express terms, that the command given to the apostles to consecrate and to receive in both kinds was imposed by our Lord upon them and upon their successors in His priesthood alone. I have already pointed out that the command in the words of institution is like the command to baptise and to absolve. Does Lord Redesdale maintain that all Christians are empowered and bound to consecrate, to baptise, and to absolve? It is a commission given to the apostles and their successors without reference to the mode of receiving the Sacraments by the faithful. To this fact not a shadow of answer has been made.

The practice of the whole Church in the East and West from the earliest traceable antiquity is an irrefragable proof of this

assertion. Communion in both kinds was administered in public, and communion in one kind was administered in private, from the earliest traceable antiquity, and throughout the whole Church. This is what the Council of Constance affirms in express words, and on this it founds its decree. Lord Redesdale has simply misunderstood its words. He has reasserted his own reading of the Council, and I leave your readers to judge between the Council and Lord Redesdale.—I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Archbishop.

Dec. 6.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—The Cardinal does not deny that my interpretation of the words of Popes Leo and Gelasius is their plain meaning, but as that does not suit the present teaching of his Church he again refers his readers to that which Roman theologians have discovered for them.

He was probably surprised at my having found out that St. Ambrose, whom he had twice triumphantly quoted as having received the sacrament in one kind only on his deathbed, died so immediately after swallowing the bread that the cup could not have been offered to him, and has nothing to say in excuse for having made use of such disingenuous and equivocal evidence, but that private communion was administered in one kind only, as if it was always so at that time, which he knows would not be true—and if it was, why quote St. Ambrose specially?

He altogether declines to answer my plain question as to the meaning of the words of Christ in administering the sacrament. He knows that they condemn his teaching, and can do no more than repeat what he has said before—that Scripture is only to be understood as his Church chooses to interpret it, which I have already replied to and refuted. But I must ask him to let us know with certainty what that Church has said on the subject of public communion in one kind only. I purposely confine my question to public communion, not as thereby admitting that private communion in one kind is right, but to prevent him, if possible, from evading a direct answer by arguing on it instead of the other.

At the Council of Clermont, in 1095, held by Pope Urban II., it was directed that none should so communicate unless he took the body separately, and the blood in like manner, unless under necessity. "*Ne quis communicat de Altare nisi corpus separatim et sanguinem similiter sumat, nisi per necessitatem et cautelam,*" thus confirming the doctrine of Popes Leo and Gelasius. Was the voice of that Council Divine, and guided by the spirit of truth? If it was, the Council of Constance, ordering that the body and blood should be received together in one kind only, was, according to the Cardinal's teaching, guilty of treason and heresy. Which Council was right? What are we to think of a Church which considers itself authorised to make Christ's plain words mean one thing at one time and a different thing at another? St. Paul foresaw this Roman heresy in uttering this caution against the acceptance of any other than apostolic teaching (Heb. xiii. 7, 8, 9). "Remember them which have the

rule over you, who have spoken to you the word of God : whose faith follow, considering the end of their conversation : Jesus Christ, the same yesterday, and to-day, and for ever. Be not carried about with divers and strange doctrines." Let all attend to this warning.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Batsford Park, Dec. 7.

REDESDALE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—If Lord Redesdale thinks it consistent with the age of life that we have attained, and the respect that we owe to ourselves, to use such words as "disingenuous," and "equivocal," and "evading," and the like, with which his correspondence down to the letter of to-day has been so copiously adorned, I gladly concede to him any advantage that can be obtained by a style which I will not imitate.

My observations on his last letter need be few.

1. I altogether deny that Lord Redesdale's interpretation of the words of St. Leo and St. Gelasius is either their plain meaning or their true meaning.

2. I was indeed surprised at his finding out that St. Ambrose received in one kind on his death-bed only because he had not time to receive the "cup;" and I suspect that I was not the only person who was surprised, or who will be surprised hereafter, at hearing the discovery.

The words of Paulinus, referred to by Lord Redesdale, are that "when St. Ambrose had received (the Lord's Body) he gave up the ghost, bearing with him the good viaticum."—*Vita S. Ambrossii*, 47, *Opp. S. Ambrossii*, tom. ii., edit. 1686.

Certainly Paulinus had no conception of a "mutilated sacrament," or of anything wanting to a perfect communion.

I must add another argument, the force of which will, I fear, be lost on Lord Redesdale, though it is fatal to his discovery. If the "cup" were present by the bedside of St. Ambrose it must either have been consecrated beforehand and reserved, or it must have been consecrated then and there by the side of the dying man. But the consecrated species of wine was never reserved for the sick; and if there were no "time" even for the administration of the "cup," how much less for the celebration of the Mass, in which alone the consecration could take place? But to those who know the facts of history this is superfluous.

3. I have not in any way declined to answer his plain question as to the meaning of our Lord in the administration of the sacrament. I have answered it in my first letter, and I know not how many times in those that followed. My answer is this: That the Lord did not impose a command in those words addressed to the apostles, that communion should be received by all Christians in both kinds. I have shown that the whole Church, East and West, has interpreted our Lord's words in the same sense as I do, and has founded upon such interpretation the practice of communion in one kind.

4. Lord Redesdale quotes the Council of Clermont, in A.D. 1095 (see *Labbe's Councils*, tom. 12, pp. 832 and 905), by which "it was directed," as Lord Redesdale says, "that none should so

communicate unless he took the Body separately and the Blood in like manner, unless under necessity."

Therefore the Council of Clermont implicitly affirms that communion in one kind, in case of necessity, is sufficient. But Lord Redesdale has omitted to translate the two last words of the decree, "*et cautelam*"—that is, by reason of caution.

If the Divine command to receive in both kinds were supposed to be suspended by necessity, no sane man will say that a Divine command can be suspended by reason of caution. The "caution" referred to by the Council proves that it recognised the entire liberty of the Church in determining the mode of administering communion to the faithful. Thereby it broadly and evidently declares that neither Divine command nor intrinsic necessity existed for giving communion in both kinds to the faithful.

The 28th decree of the Council of Clermont pointedly affirms all that I have affirmed in this correspondence, and is absolutely fatal to Lord Redesdale's assertions.

Can anything more visibly demonstrate the futility of all such controversies as this present correspondence? Has our Divine Saviour left the nations of the world to find out His truth and His will in the interminable wilderness of verbal and literary criticism? I must, therefore, for the thousand and first time repeat that, by the perpetual presence and perpetual assistance of the Spirit of Truth, the voice of the Church is Divine. Lord Redesdale denies this, and this present controversy is a sample of the fruits of that denial. I have affirmed the voice of the Church to be Divine, and not a relevant argument has been offered in contradiction.—I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Archbishop.

Dec. 10.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—The Cardinal objects to my having applied the words "disingenuous, equivocal, and evading" to some of his arguments. I did so in order to draw attention to the straits into which Roman theologians are often driven in defending the doctrines of their Church. It will be for your readers to judge whether they have been unjustly applied.

As to St. Ambrose, Paulinus relates that "the Bishop of Vercelli, after he had retired to rest, heard a voice calling to him, Arise, make haste, because he is about to depart; and he went and administered to the saint the body of our Lord, which, when he had received, he gave up the ghost, taking with him a good viaticum." As Ambrose was dying, full preparation for the proper administration of the sacrament at the shortest notice would be kept ready, and Paulinus would be justified in saying that the faith which called for it rendered what was taken a good viaticum, although death prevented its full reception. But what occurred cannot be considered to afford more than equivocal evidence in support of communion in one kind being accepted by St. Ambrose.

I must now add a word as to St. Ambrose's opinion on that subject. In his work *De Sacram.* Lib. IV., c. 6, he says, "If

as often as the blood is poured out it is poured out for the remission of sins, it behoveth me always to receive it, that my sins may always be forgiven me. I, who am always sinning, ought always to have medicine." Is it not disingenuous to quote in favour of a mutilated sacrament the man who wrote thus, because after having received the bread he died before the wine could be given to him?

I asked the Cardinal to show whether there is anything in Christ's words which can be held to authorise the omission of either kind, or the sufficiency of the one without the other; and why Christ instituted two kinds if one was enough, and He did not intend both to be received? His reply is that no one believes those words to impose a commandment on the faithful to receive in both kinds. My question was that he should state what words of our Lord justified such a belief. Am I not right in saying that he evaded it in his reply?

I asked the Cardinal to reconcile the different findings of the Councils of Clermont and Constance; the first declaring that no one should communicate unless he take the body and blood separately, except in case of necessity and under caution; and the other that thenceforth the body and blood should be received by those consecrating under each species, but by the laity under one only, and that all who asserted this to be unlawful were to be repelled as heretics and punished severely. The only excuse he can give is that the decision at Clermont recognised the entire liberty of the Church to determine the mode of administering the communion; his conclusion, I suppose, being that Clermont was right in ordering one way with qualifications, and Constance equally right in ordering another way without qualifications. This does not appear to me satisfactory evidence as to the Divine guidance of the Church of Rome in councils.

It is useless to continue a controversy so met, and I now will sum up the case. The questions I put to the Cardinal in my first letter, were, first, "Is it treason and heresy to say that history informs us that when Christ instituted the holy sacrament, He ordained that His blood was to be received through the wine, as well as His body through the bread, and that all ought now to receive the sacrament in the manner He ordained?" Second, "Is it treason and heresy to say that antiquity informs us that, in the time of the apostles and long afterwards, all who received the sacrament partook of the wine as well as the bread, and that we ought all to do as they did?"

The Cardinal admits that communion in both kinds is not intrinsically erroneous, and that Christ instituted, and that He, the apostles, and the primitive Church administered, in both kinds; but that, as the Church of Rome at the Council of Constance, 1,400 years after Christ's institution, decreed that communion should be thenceforth in one kind only, it is now treason and heresy to say that communion in both kinds is necessary for all, because the authority of that Council is Divine! Can any one with common sense, who is at liberty to exercise it, accept such reasoning as sound, which declares that the decrees of the Church of Rome at the Council of Constance ought to be held of higher authority than the words and acts of Christ, as interpreted and acted upon by the apostles and primitive Church?

My third question was, when and how the Church of Rome was Divinely instructed "to order that which was contrary to what Christ Himself ordered in express words." The reply is that Christ promised that the spirit of truth should abide in the Church for ever when He said to the apostles, "Go ye and teach all nations, baptising them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost; teaching them to observe all things that I have commanded you; and lo, I am with you always, even to the end of the world." This promise is only to a Church which teaches what He has commanded, and He is not with it if it does otherwise. I confirmed this by the quotation from St. Paul (Heb. xiii.) in my last letter, in which that apostle cautions his hearers against "being carried about by strange doctrines." No Church has been so carried about as the Church of Rome, with her communion in one kind, her indulgences, and other errors, and within the last twenty years by the invention of two new Articles of Faith, the Immaculate Conception of the Virgin and Papal Infallibility, of which the apostles and evangelists were ignorant, and for which no Divine authority can be shown. St. Paul says (Gal. i., 8, 9), "Though we, or an angel from Heaven, preach any other gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed. As we said before, so say I now again, If any man preach any other gospel unto you than that ye have received, let him be accursed."

With these words from an inspired apostle I close my part in this controversy.—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

Batsford Park, Dec. 12.

REDESDALE.

TO THE EDITOR OF "THE DAILY TELEGRAPH."

SIR,—My summing up of this correspondence shall be shorter than Lord Redesdale's. He has attempted to show that the authority of the Catholic Church is not Divine, because it has erred; and he has endeavoured to show that it has erred, because it has ordained communion to be received in one kind. To prove this, Lord Redesdale has affirmed that the words of our Lord in instituting the holy sacrament impose a command upon all Christians to receive it in both kinds. In answer I have shown:

1. That this interpretation of our Lord's words is contrary to the interpretation of all ages down to the outbreak of modern controversies.

2. That it is contrary to the immemorial practice of the Church, which has, from the earliest traceable antiquity, maintained the practice of giving communion in private in one kind only. Communion in both kinds was given in public, and communion in one kind was given in private, from the second till the twelfth century. Communion in one kind, then, gradually prevailed till the Council of Constance, for wise and evident reasons, ordained that communion in one kind should thenceforward be the rule both in public and in private. What is sufficient in private is sufficient in public; no Divine command to the contrary existing. If this is "evasion," what is directness?

Lastly, I have given proof from the words of our Lord in Holy Scripture:

1. That the Spirit of Truth, by His perpetual presence and perpetual assistance, preserves the Church from error in faith.

2. That the Voice of the Church is therefore Divine, because it is the Voice of the Spirit of Truth. "He that heareth you heareth me."

This has never been met by a shadow of relevant argument.

It would, indeed, be a grave thing to deny the perpetual presence and assistance of the Spirit of Truth in the Church. But this Divine Truth must be denied before it can be shown that the Catholic Church has erred. If the Spirit of Truth be with it for ever, the conclusion is inevitable.

To appeal from this Divine Voice to any other tribunal is both treason and heresy. And these high spiritual crimes are not "newly invented" by the Catholic Church. They are moral obliquities, as I have long ago shown, as old as the Divine Authority against which they offend. To appeal from this Gospel, which the apostle preached, is that "other Gospel" which St. Paul says would be sin even in an angel.—I remain, Sir, your faithful servant,

Dec. 14.

HENRY EDWARD, Cardinal Archbishop.

APPENDIX.

CARDINAL MANNING in his last letter boldly attempts to close the controversy, by asserting that he has shown :—

1. That the Protestant interpretation of our Lord's words is contrary to the interpretation of all ages down to the outbreak of modern controversies.

2. That it is contrary to the immemorial practice of the Church, which has, from the earliest traceable antiquity maintained the practice of giving communion in private in one kind only.

We confidently assert, that he has proved neither of these propositions ; and that his instances of Communion in one kind only are well characterised by the Cardinal himself, in his letter of 30th October last—"Throughout the whole of those ages Communion was given in one kind to the sick ; to those who were in prison, to households in time of persecution, and in other circumstances of necessity ;" which admission is fatal to the assumption, with which he has attempted to close the controversy.

It will be seen that Cardinal Manning's argument amounts merely to an apology for what the Church of Rome has done, and that when his apology is not accepted, he is driven by the exigencies of his position, as having accepted the Cardinalite after the promulgation of the decree of Infallibility, to a mere reaffirmation of his original assertion.

Lord Redesdale argues, that our Lord's words, "This do in remembrance of Me," applied equally to bread and wine, and are *positive commands*. If one is, both are, or there is no command to administer the sacrament at all. He calls on the Cardinal to show any qualification of the words of our Saviour—which he has not attempted to do—but points to some references in history to private communion in one kind (not earlier, however, than the 2nd century), and those cases of *necessity*, not recognised in the public services of the Church. The Cardinal can show no *divine command* to withhold the cup from the laity, before that, which he *asserts to be such*, in the decrees of the Council of Constance, 1,400 years later than the institution of the practice by our Lord, as adopted by the primitive Church instructed by the Apostles. If the Spirit of Truth was with the primitive Church, the decision at Constance was, by the Cardinal's own reasoning, *treason and heresy*.

The comments made simultaneously with the appearance of the foregoing letters from time to time in the *Press and St. James's Chronicle* are too long to be reprinted here, but the following extracts from our leading articles, and the contemporaneous letters, which have also appeared in our pages, from a highly-valued correspondent, show that Lord Redesdale's position is that of a faithful and highly-intelligent member of the

Church of England, and that the Cardinal's assumption of victory is based on mere assertion and misstatements of Lord Redesdale's arguments.

Extracted from "The Press and St. James's Chronicle," Oct 30, 1875

The Church of Rome and the Cardinal repudiate the conclusion of the twentieth article of the Church of England which declares:—"Wherefore, although the Church be a witness and a keeper of Holy Writ, yet as it ought not to decree anything against the same, so besides the same ought it not to enforce anything to be believed for necessity of salvation." Were it not that the study of the articles of the Church of England had been so grossly neglected of late years, it would be superfluous to adduce them in illustration of the utterly anti-scriptural character of Cardinal Manning's dogmatism, but, as we are on the subject of the Infallibility of the Pope as asserted by the Papal Council of 1870, which was convened not only without the consent but against the will of many European Sovereigns; we will quote the twenty-first article of the Church of England, which speaks of the authority of General Councils:—"General Councils may not be gathered together without the commandment and will of Princes. And when they be gathered together (forasmuch as they be an assembly of men whereof all be not governed with the Spirit and Word of God) they may err, and sometimes have erred, even in things pertaining unto God. Wherefore things ordained by them as necessary to salvation have neither strength nor authority, unless it may be declared that they be taken out of Holy Scripture."

One passage in the Cardinal's letter of the 27th is so characteristic that we cannot refrain from quoting it:—"Finally, Lord Redesdale says, 'I hold the authority of Christ to be Divine, and that it is heresy to appeal from it. So far I agree with the Cardinal.' But the Cardinal will not agree with Lord Redesdale even in this, and goes on: 'I have nowhere said anything so needless. I said, 'The authority of the Church is Divine.' Here the Cardinal points to a doctrine which many parts of his writings show, that he has borrowed from the Jesuits, that the dicta of an Infallible Pope, as supposed to express the Infallibility of the Church, are really of superior authority to that of the Holy Scriptures themselves. This blasphemous invention the Jesuits borrowed from the Jewish Rabbins, who declared, and with reference to the interpretation of the Holy Scriptures, as a maxim, "that the latest authority" (meaning their own) "governs."* . . . "For their casuistry," writes the elder Disraeli, "I have compared the Rabbins with the sons of Ignatius, but they have not usually like the Jesuits, justified crimes or systematised immorality. . . . Dictators of the human intellect, the Rabbins, like their successors, the Papal Christians, attempted to raise a spurious theocracy of their own."†

* Jewish Dogmas, Pp. 41, 45, 46. Seeleys, London, 1849.

† "Genius of Judaism." Edward Moxon, Dover-street, London. 1833. Pp. 168, 78.

Extracted from "The Press and St. James's Chronicle," Nov. 6, 1875.

The Cardinal's quarrel with the Reformed Churches, as he states himself is, because they adhere to that which he calls the "master error of the Reformation* . . . that in place of a "Living and Divine Teacher, the Church has a written Book." And again, when describing the purport of his work, the Cardinal writes:—"From all that has been said it follows that "the Scriptures separated from the Church perish. The appeal "from the living voice of the Church to the letter of Scripture "destroyed the Divine custody of the letter and of the sense of "the Sacred Books." In a previous passage he had written:—"The Protestant Reformation staked its existence upon the "Bible; and as Protestants have extensively denied or undermined its inspiration, no other subject can be so vital to their "religion or *more opportune for us.*" The italics are ours. Thus this leading Ultramontane unites with the latitudinarians of the present day in seeking to induce the world to treat the Holy Scriptures of the New and of the Old Testament, as cast-off clothes, save in so far as he and his allies may be able to pervert their meaning for the purpose of feigning their authority in support of the Jesuit coined doctrine of Papal Infallibility. . .

The Cardinal's aversion to argument cannot be better shown than by the following passage from the dedication of his book on the "Holy Ghost" to the Oblates of St. Charles (a Monastic Order):—" 'Contend with men,' as a loved and honoured friend "has said of the Apostles. " 'They argued not, but preached, "and conscience did the rest.' " It would be rather difficult to prove, that St. Paul was averse to argument; but, perhaps, the Cardinal would deny that he was an Apostle.

Extracted from "The Press and St. James's Chronicle," Dec. 4, 1875.

We have felt from the first, that Lord Redesdale is so deeply imbued with the faith of the Church of England in the pre-eminent inspiration of the Holy Scripture, that he failed to estimate the unscrupulous character of his opponent. We use the words, "pre-eminent inspiration of the Holy Scripture," in the sense of the Sixth Article of the Church of England, which asserts the infinite superiority of the authority of the Holy Scripture over that of all other history and tradition in the following terms:—"Holy Scripture containeth all things necessary to salvation: so that whatsoever is not read therein, nor may be "proved thereby, is not to be required of any man, that it should "be believed as an article of the Faith, or be thought requisite "or necessary to salvation." The Article then goes on to enumerate the Books of the Old and New Testament, contained in the Authorised Version of the Bible as "the Holy Scripture" to which it refers. We repeat, that Lord Redesdale, in undertaking to argue with Dr. Manning, seems not to have duly estimated the contemptuous derogation of the authority of the Holy Scripture, to which Cardinal Manning is bound by his acceptance and promulgation of the supreme authority of the Pope, when

* "The Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost." Longmans, Green, and Co. 1868. Pp. 177, 197, 127; Dedication, p. x.

claiming to speak *ex cathedrâ*, as the living organ of the Holy Ghost. This pretension seems to most Christians simply blasphemous ; but the Cardinal has over and over again affirmed it, and puts it as follows in his letter of Thursday last, which appeared in the *Daily Telegraph* of yesterday :—" Lord Redesdale," writes the Cardinal, " recognises Divine authority only in the " Holy Scripture. I affirm the Divine authority to exist in the " perpetual presence and perpetual assistance of the same Spirit " of Truth, by whose guidance those Scriptures were written, " and in the interpretation of which He cannot contradict Himself."

" If Lord Redesdale denies this proposition, on what basis " higher than human history does he rest his belief of the inspira- " tion and Canon of Scripture itself?" . . . The Cardinal totally failed to justify, on Scriptural grounds, the mutilated Sacrament ordained by the Church of Rome. He then appealed to antiquity. Lord Redesdale exceeded his first intention, and demonstrated the unfairness, with which the Cardinal used the patristic authorities he had chosen. The reply of the Cardinal is practically—" You dispute my historical authorities ; the Holy " Scripture is nothing but a portion of history. Why may not I " dispute that portion of history? I affirm, that the Holy " Scripture has no more inspired authority, than had the Council " and the modern Popes, who have undertaken to contravene " its record in the matter of the Holy Communion."

Extracted from ' The Press and St. James's Chronicle,' Dec. 11, 1875.

The Redesdale *versus* Manning controversy still continues. The point chosen by Lord Redesdale for this controversy is, in itself, important, as proving the anti-Scriptural nature of the doctrines upon which the Church of Rome appears finally to have founded what she calls her religion. Dr. Gibson, Bishop of Lincoln, and afterwards Bishop of London, in his " Preservative against Popery,"* cites the authority of Cardinal Bona :—" That " the whole Church, both laity and clergy, for about one thousand two hundred years, received in both kinds, even in the " Church of Rome itself. And Gregory De Valentia (though a " Jesuit) tells us that the custom of communicating in one kind " began to be generally received, even in the Latin Church, not " long before the Council of Constance, which began in the year " 1414." The learned Bishop has also left it upon record :—" And that this innovation might be removed, and the whole " Sacrament administered according to Christ's institution, was " earnestly desired, not only by Protestants, but by many Popish " Princes and Churches, as is manifest by their request to that " purpose, made to the Pope and the Council of Trent. The " French Ambassador besought the Pope in the name of the

* The passages, here quoted, are contained in a discourse upon " The Necessity of a Reformation," by Dr. Stratford, late Bishop of Chester, which Dr. Gibson includes in his work " A Preservative Against Popery." The copy used is in a collection published by the British Society for Promoting the Religious Principles of the Reformation, at their Office, 8, Exeter Hall, Strand. 1848. Vol. I., pages 45, 46 and 47.

“ King, the Church, and the Prelates of France, that he would grant the communion of the cup of the people. The Duke of Bavaria, at the Council of Trent, demanded by his ambassador the administration of the Eucharist under both kinds ; and that not for the sectaries’ sake, to reduce them, but to retain those who as yet continued in communion with them. The Bavarian was seconded by the Emperor’s ambassadors, who represented to the Council that not only the kingdom of Bohemia would never be satisfied without the cup, but that there were Catholics in Hungary, Austria, Moravia, Silesia, Corinthia, Carniola, Styria, Bavaria, Suebia, and other parts of Germany, who desired the cup with great zeal ; that therefore his Majesty demanded it, not for the heretics, but for Catholics only.”

The authority of Bishop Gibson’s work is admitted to be high ; he gives (Volume 1, pages 46-47) references to each of the Roman Catholic works, the substance of which he states in the passage we have quoted, and we can scarcely adduce stronger proof of the audacity of Cardinal Manning’s statement in his last letter to Lord Redesdale :—“ The practice of the whole Church in the East and West from the earliest trace of antiquity is an irrefragable proof of this assertion. Communion in both kinds was administered in public, and Communion in one kind was administered in private from the earliest traceable antiquity and throughout the whole Church.” If this were the fact why has the Cardinal affirmed in his work on the “ Temporal Mission of the Holy Ghost,” that “ the appeal to antiquity is both a treason and a heresy ?” The Cardinal has utterly failed to prove that private Communion in one kind, except under circumstances of absolute necessity, was ever, previous to the Council of Constance, generally adopted. Necessity has no law, and the Church of England holds, that the earnest and express desire to communicate, when the attainment of the symbols is impossible, must be held sufficient. We repeat, that the Cardinal has not proved, that the Church ever sanctioned Communion in one kind, where both kinds were attainable, for 1200 years, as a general practice. But what must be thought of the Cardinal’s position, when he began by asserting, that public Communion for the laity in one kind was from the earliest traceable antiquity the practice of the Church ? This was not asserted either by the Council of Constance or in the Council of Trent, which sat two hundred years later. The Cardinal, nevertheless, seems to have imagined, that he might cast any assertion, he chose, in the teeth of Lord Redesdale because he is a layman, although chairman of the House of Lords. The Cardinal is too proud or too cautious to adduce the *reasons*, which were assigned by those, who attended the Council of Constance for its decision, that the cup should be withheld both in private and in public Communion from the laity ; but Dr. Stratford, as cited by Dr. Gibson, is less reticent. He writes :—“ John Gerson, who was himself present at the Council, in a treatise, which he wrote in defence of that decree, hath told us they (the reasons) were these :—1. The danger of spilling the wine. 2. The danger in carrying it from place to place. 3. In defiling the vessels (which ought to be kept as sacred

* The Cardinal’s letter, dated December 6.

“ things) by being touched and handled by laymen. 4. In
 “ the long beards of the laymen. 5. In keeping the conse-
 “ crated wine for the use of the sick ; because vinegar may
 “ be generated in the vessel, and so the blood of Christ would
 “ cease to be there, and pure vinegar would be administered
 “ for the blood of Christ ; [though, by the way, if the con-
 “ secrated wine be transubstantiated, it seems strange that
 “ it should degenerate into vinegar] besides, in summer flies
 “ may be generated, and sometimes it may putrify and become
 “ loathsome ; and some might loath to drink it, because many
 “ others had drunk of it before. 6. Wine would be chargeable,
 “ especially in such places where it is scarce. There would be,
 “ moreover, danger of freezing in winter ; and there would be
 “ further danger in giving occasions many ways to the people to
 “ believe, that which is false ; as that laymen, as to the receiving of
 “ the Sacrament, are of equal dignity with the priests.” . . .
 The purpose was to exalt the priests and to degrade the laity.
 In the third reason it is assumed, that the laity are so vile, that
 it would be unbecoming, perhaps sacrilegious, that they should
 be permitted to touch or handle the vessels in which the ele-
 ments are or have been con^{secrated}. In the sixth reason it is
 plainly stated that the cup was to be withheld from the laity lest
 it should (as the Council would have it erroneously) be ima-
 gined that “ laymen, as to the receiving of the sacrament, are of
 equal dignity with priests.”

Extracted from “The Press and St. James’s Chronicle,” Dec. 18, 1875.

That which Lord Redesdale has succeeded in bringing promi-
 nently before the public in this controversy is, that the Papal
 Church, whilst avowedly and practically the most intolerant of
 all Christian denominations, has become the most latitudinarian
 in her creed ; if indeed this Church still deserves to be called
 Christian, her title to which designation not a few, and among
 them men of exemplary piety and discretion, have long since
 disputed and still dispute ; affirming that the Papal Church is
 Anti-Christ. That the power, which now really governs that
 Church, to a great extent deserves this imputation, we do not
 deny. One of the characteristics of Anti-Christ is untruth, and
 when, in Cardinal Manning’s last letter, that of the 14th of this
 month, we read : “ Lord Redesdale has affirmed, that the words
 “ of our Lord in instituting the Holy Sacrament impose a com-
 “ mand upon all Christians to receive it in both kinds. In answer
 “ I have shown, that this interpretation of our Lord’s words is
 “ contrary to the interpretation of all ages down to the outbreak
 “ of modern controversies,” we are astonished at the Cardinal’s
 power of assertion in distinct contradiction to his own previous
 admissions and to evidence, which he has not even attempted to
 rebut, that Communion in both kinds for all the faithful was the
 practice of the Primitive Church for centuries.

Extracted from "The Press and St. James's Chronicle," Nov. 13, 1875

COMMUNION IN ONE KIND.

TO THE EDITOR

SIR,—As Lord Redesdale appears to have now closed his correspondence with Cardinal Manning on the above subject, perhaps I may venture to ask you to insert the following, as bearing on the historical assertions, by which the Cardinal alleges it to be proved that "communion in one kind and communion in both kinds were *alike in practice* throughout the Church from the ages nearest to the Apostles, which," he adds, "is an *historical demonstration* that neither any Divine command, nor any intrinsic necessity for communion in both kinds was ever believed to exist."

What are his authorities?

The Cardinal refers to *Pope Gelasius* and *Leo I.*, the *Venerable Bede* and the *Mass of the Presanctified*, in support of his assertions.

Allow me to transcribe exactly what those Popes really said upon this important subject.

Pope Gelasius I., who did not die till A.D. 496, expressly says that to minister the communion in one kind is open sacrilege:—"We have found that some, having received only the portion wherein is the holy body, abstain from the cup of the sacred blood; who, without doubt (forasmuch as I know not with what superstition they are taught), should receive the *whole sacrament*, or be kept from the whole; because the *division* of one and the same mystery cannot come without *great sacrilege*."

Comperimus autem quod quidam, sumpta tantum modo corporis sacri portione, a calice sacrati cruoris abstineant. Qui procul dubio (quoniam nescio qua superstitione docentur obstringi) aut integra sacramenta percipiant, aut ab integris arceantur: quia divisio unius, ejusdemque mysterii sine grandi sacrilegio non potest provenire.—Gelas. in Corp. Jur. Canon. Lugd. 1661. Decret. Grat. Tert. Pars. de Consecr. Dist. ii. cap. 12. Col. 1168.

Pope Leo the Great, in treating of the Manicheans, writes thus:—"They withdraw themselves from the sacrament of our salvation. With unworthy mouth they receive Christ's body; but they altogether refuse to *drink the blood of our redemption*, which things we would advertise you of, that both such men may be manifested by these tokens unto you, and also that they, being brought to light, may be *thrust out of the Church* by sacerdotal authority."

Abdicant enim se sacramento salutis humanæ. Ore indigno Christi corpus accipiunt: sanguinem autem redemptionis nostræ haurire omnino declinant. Quod ideo vestram volumus scire sanctitatem, ut vobis hujusmodi homines his manifestantur indiciiis, et notati et proñti a sanctorum societate sacerdotali auctoritate pellantur.—Leon. Mag. Op. Lut. 1623. Col. 108. Serm. iv. de quadrag.

The *Venerable Bede*, who died A.D. 735, testifies to the practice of the English Church in his day in these words:—"Thus Christ's body is not killed, nor His *blood* shed by the hands of

unbelievers to their own destruction ; but it is received by the mouth of believers to salvation.”—[Bedæ Homil. Hiem. de Sanct.]

That the *hermits* in the wilderness or the *sick* may from an early period have communicated in one kind only may be admitted ; but these were evidently *exceptional* cases, and even as regards the private communion of the *sick* was only occasional, for *St. Jerome* tells of the “ body of our Lord being carried in a basket, and the blood in a glass vessel, to relieve the poor.”—[Qui Corpus Domini, canistro vimineo. Sanguinem portat in vitro.—Epist and Rust Monach. Hieron, op. ep. xcv. Tom. iv., Pars ii. Col. 777, 778.]

The only other instance of alleged half Communion to which Cardinal Manning refers is that which is termed *Missa Præsanctificatorum*. It is of the more importance, because it was a *public*, and not a private Communion. In the Greek Church it has been customary, from the earliest times, during the season of Lent, to consecrate the Eucharist only on Saturday and Sunday, and to reserve a portion of what was then consecrated for administration on the remaining days of each week. In the Latin Church, the same usage of administering the previously consecrated Eucharist was observed on Good Friday. The Cardinal and other Roman Catholic divines endeavour to prove that this Communion, or *missa præsanctificatorum*, was only in one kind. But, in the case of the Western Church, Cassander expressly informs us (*de comm. sub. utr. spec. p. 1027*) that the *Ordo Romanus*, in the office for Good Friday, directs that “ wine not previously consecrated should be consecrated with the Lord’s prayer, and by putting the consecrated bread into it, in order that the people may be able to communicate fully.” And as to the case of the Eastern Church, *Leo Allatius* has proved that in the communion in question there were both the elements of bread and wine ; either both consecrated before, or else the wine consecrated by contact with the bread. The fact is, that the Cardinal, following Bellarmine, is misled into taking this for Communion in one kind because, both in the Eastern and Western Church, the bread alone was reserved, not the wine. They fail to observe that, before the actual Communion took place, the præconsecrated bread was put into a cup of wine, and the Lord’s prayer said over it, by which ceremony the wine was considered to be consecrated ; and then both species were administered to the people.

This *missa præsanctificatorum*, then, so far from supporting the cause of half-communion, is directly opposed to it. With your permission I may return to this important subject again.—Yours obediently,

AN OLD CATHOLIC.

Extracted from “ *The Press and St. James’s Chronicle*,” Nov. 20, 1875.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,—When examining in my previous letter the principal historical authorities referred to by Cardinal Manning, and showing that they were all strongly *against*, instead of being in favour of, his assertion that “ communion in one kind and communion in both kinds were *alike* in practice throughout the Church from the ages nearest to the Apostles,” I neglected to

notice two instances which he relies on as proof that communion in one kind was, from a very early period, considered sufficient by the Church. These were those of Serapion and St. Ambrose, whom, he asserts, immediately before their deaths, to have received the sacrament in one species only.

Now, what do these cases amount to?

Serapion had been, according to Dionysius, excommunicated for publicly joining in heathen sacrifices, but when dying sent his son for a priest, who being himself sick at the time and unable to go to him, sent the sacrament to him, directing the lad to moisten the bread (but *how* is not stated) before putting it into the dying man's mouth. The words are *αποβρεξαι κεινουςας* which leave it quite as possible that the priest meant him to dip the bread into the wine as to moisten it with water; and I quoted in my last a passage from St. Jerome, in which he states that the *body* of our Lord was carried in a basket and the *blood* in a glass vessel to relieve the poor. Even, however, if Dionysius had expressly stated that the bread alone was sent, and directed to be moistened, not with wine but water, how could the conduct of this single priest towards a dying penitent, whom he had no power to visit, much less to absolve from his notorious sins, show what was the usual custom in administration even to the sick or dying at that period? I admitted in my last letter that there were to be found in patristic literature notices of *private* communion of the sick in one kind, and also of *hermits* in the wilderness; but these were obviously exceptional cases, based upon the difficulty of getting wine in the desert, or the state of the sick man, or danger of spilling the wine, or of its turning sour if carried to a distance.

The case of *St. Ambrose* is equally unsatisfactory. The facts, as stated by Paulinus, who wrote *St. Ambrose's* life, are simply these: that as soon as the Bishop of Vercelli had administered to Ambrose "*the Body of the Lord*," and the holy man had received and swallowed it, he forthwith expired. Surely this does not amount to a recognition on his part, or on the part of those about him, of the practice of half Communion; but simply to this, that he died before the cup could be administered—if, indeed, the phrase, "*the Body of our Lord*" (*Corpus Domini*), was not here used by Paulinus as denoting the *whole* Eucharist, which, having regard to the views of *St. Ambrose* himself as evinced in his writings, is highly probable. Let these short extracts suffice:—

St. Ambrose (de Sacram. lib. iv. cap. 6, sec. 28), speaking to the people concerning the Eucharist, says, "If, as often as the Blood is poured out for the remission of sins, it behoveth me always to receive it, that my sins may always be forgiven me. I, who am always sinning, ought always to have medicine." Again, commenting on the xi. chap. of 1 Corinth., he says, "The testament is established with blood, because blood is the evidence of the divine goodness, in token of which we receive the mystical cup of the Blood to the refreshment of our body and of our soul." And in another passage of the same comment he says, "Because we have been delivered by the death of our Lord, mindful of this, in eating the Flesh and drinking the Blood, which have been

offered for us, we signify that we have obtained in those the New Testament."

The scholastic fiction of *Concomitance* was not then invented, and it is quite impossible to believe that St. Ambrose when dying declined or voluntarily omitted receiving the *blood* as well as the body of our Lord, which he so emphatically insisted on in the above passages in his writings.

I should, however, do injustice to the weight of patristic and historical authority if I were to rest satisfied with showing the weakness of the authorities referred to by Cardinal Manning; and I must ask you to allow me to quote a few authorities, out of many similar, which I conceive demonstrate, that whatever laxity of practice may have grown up during the course of centuries in the mode of administering *private* communion, the practice of the Church in giving *public* communion was uniform for over a *thousand years*.

In the first place, let us see what the ancient Roman Liturgy says upon the subject, and a higher authority can scarcely be desired upon the practice of any Church than its authorised Liturgy.

In the *Liber Sacramentorum*, or *Sacramentary of Pope Gregory the Great*, the following directions are given respecting the distribution of the Eucharistic elements:—"When the priest giveth the Lord's body, let him say, 'The Body of our Lord Jesus Christ keep him unto eternal life. Amen.' And let the recipient say, 'I will receive the celestial Bread, and will call on the name of the Lord.' Likewise, in *giving the Cup*, let the priest say, 'The Blood of our Lord Jesus Christ keep thee unto eternal life.' And let the recipient say, '*I will receive the Cup of salvation*'" (Cassand Liturg. cap. xxxi., p. 75, Paris, 1616.) Again, in the "*Ordo Romanus*" (an epitome of the rites and ceremonies of the Roman Church, made, it is supposed, in the 8th century), we find the following instructions relative to the administration of the Eucharist, the Pope himself being one of the celebrants: "The archdeacon, taking the cup from the hand of the first bishop, confirms with the Lord's Blood *all those* to whom the Pope has administered the Lord's Body Afterwards the Bishops or Presbyters administer the Bread *to the people*, and after these the deacons administer *the Cup*" (Cassand. Ord. Rom. Liturg. cap. xxii., p. 51. sq.).

After the above conclusive testimony of the Ancient Roman Liturgy no one can be surprised at the following statement of one of the most learned ritualists of the Roman communion, whose works are of the highest authority upon all questions connected with the rites and ceremonies of the Church—I mean Cardinal BONA. (Rer., Liturg., lib. ii., c., xviii., sect. 1.) This distinguished author writes as follows:—"To the ancient rites of the Eucharist belongs Communion *under both Species*, a question most fiercely controverted between Catholics and heretics. However, omitting disputation, I shall dwell only on those matters which relate to the ancient custom of administering the communion under one or both species; reducing, very briefly, to two points all that is to be found in the ponderous volumes written on the subject by the most distinguished men—viz., whether Communion under both Species has always been in

use; and whether it was permitted formerly to communicate under one species only. Now, the dispute may be easily settled, if we distinguish between *public* communion during the solemnities of the Mass, and *private* communion outside the church and congregation; inasmuch as it is *certain that, anciently, all without distinction (passim), clerics and laity, men and women, received the holy mysteries under both species, when they were present at the solemn celebrations of them, and made oblation, and participated thereof.* But out of the (time of) sacrifice, and out of the Church, communion under one species was always and everywhere in use*. In the first part of this assertion all agree, both Catholics and sectaries; nor can any one deny it who is imbued with even the slightest knowledge of ecclesiastical matters; for, always and everywhere, from the first foundation (*primordiis*) of the Church down to the twelfth century, the faithful communicated under the species of bread and wine. In the beginning of that century the use of the Cup began by degrees to become obsolete. This change was first made by different Bishops, in their own churches, and afterwards was canonically established as a universal law by the Synod of Constance." Now, putting aside, for a moment, what Cardinal Bona asserts respecting the *distinction* to be observed between public and private Communion, and confining our attention to what he says of the former, we see that a Roman Catholic writer, of the very highest rank and authority, admits, as an unquestionable fact, which "no one imbued with the slightest knowledge of ecclesiastical matters can deny," that during a period of twelve centuries, beginning with the age of the Apostles, the Eucharist in *both* species was invariably and universally administered in the public service of the Church. This is as ample a testimony to the practice of the universal Church as Lord Redesdale could possibly desire. It exposes the disingenuousness (to use no harsher term) of the Tridentine Fathers, in asserting that communion under both species was *not unfrequent (!)* in the primitive Church; and it shows the futility of all the arguments, from Scripture and antiquity, by which the less scrupulous champions of Rome—Eckius, Harding, Bellarmine, &c.—have attempted to prove that the practice of publicly communicating in both kinds was never, from the first, universal.

Now that public attention has been directed to this important controversy, perhaps you may permit me to return to the subject again.—Yours obediently, AN OLD CATHOLIC.

Extracted from "The Press and St. James's Chronicle," Dec. 4, 1875.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,—Though no attempt has been made, to my knowledge, by any of the Roman Catholic writers of the present day to gainsay or turn aside the force of the authorities to which I called attention in my last letter, I mean especially to the *Sacra-*

* This does not mean that communion in *both kinds* was not also in use *out of the Church*; for Cardinal Bona himself says a little further down, "I do not deny that sometimes the blood of Christ, together with his body, was carried outside the Church scil. to the sick."—Loc. c. sec. 2.

mentary of *Pope Gregory the Great* and the learned Cardinal BONA, yet, considering the grave importance of the question lately discussed between Lord Redesdale and Cardinal Manning, you may, perhaps, permit me to supplement the letters I have previously written by a few further observations.

Considering the positive command given by our Blessed Lord in instituting the sacrament of the Eucharist, "*Drink ye all of this,*" one may reasonably require *clear proof* that the command was *limited* to priests alone, and, as Cardinal Manning tells us, to the *celebrant* priests only, and that it did not extend to mere *recipients* of the Eucharist, whether lay or clerical. We have nothing, however, but mere assertion to show any such limitation; for first, how does it appear that the Apostles (including, be it remembered, *Judas Iscariot*), were at that time *priests*? They were certainly not *officiating* priests, for Our Lord Himself, the Great High Priest, was *Himself* the celebrator, and the Apostles were merely recipients of the body and blood which He administered to them, and in no sense celebrants. Neither is there any solid reason for considering them as *priests* at all at the time of the institution of the Eucharist. Their formal commission as pastors and ministers of the future Church seems most evidently to have been conferred on them subsequently to Our Lord's resurrection, when, as St. John informs us (chap. xx. v. 21, 22), "Jesus said to them, Peace be unto you; as My Father hath sent me, even so send I you; and when He had said this, He breathed on them, and saith unto them, Receive ye the Holy Spirit." But suppose we were to admit that the Apostles were priests at the time of their receiving both species, the admission only serves to exhibit more plainly the inconsistency of Cardinal Manning's theory. If the Apostles communicated in both kinds as *priests*, why should the laity be permitted to receive *either* species? Why not deny them, as a necessary consequence, the bread as well as the cup? The Council of Trent, whose views Cardinal Manning adopts, decrees that not *all* priests are to communicate in both kinds, but only the celebrant or officiating priest. How is this restriction to be reconciled with the fact that all the Apostles, though not celebrants, did receive in both kinds?

It is scarcely necessary to say that there is no trace in the New Testament writings, which exhibit the history of the infant Church, of any distinction between the presbyters and the people in respect to receiving the Eucharist.

If any such distinction existed, we should expect to find some allusion at least to it in the passage of the 1st Epistle to the Corinthians, where St. Paul speaks at considerable length on the subject of the due observance of this sacrament. But *he is entirely silent as to any such distinction*; or, rather, the whole drift and scope of his statements and reasonings leads us to conclude that the people, no less than the presbyters, communicated in both kinds. The addresses, warnings, and exhortations contained in the 11th and 12th chapters are evidently *general*. If any special reference be intended, it would seem that the laity rather than the presbyters were the objects of it. It is far more likely that the former were guilty of partaking in the idol feasts, and profaning the Eucharist, than the latter. Now, one argu-

ment by which the Apostle seeks to convince the Corinthian Christians of the heinousness of the crime of which they had been guilty is this, "*Ye cannot drink the cup of the Lord and the cup of Devils,*" (1 Cor. x. 21). This would be no argument to laymen unless they were permitted to drink "*the cup of the Lord.*" And in the 11th chapter, he enforces the duty of self-examination before communion, and of a reverent partaking of the sacrament, in terms which clearly show that *all* those whom he addresses—*laity, as well as presbyters*—were wont to receive the cup as well as the bread. "*As often as you shall eat this bread and drink this chalice, you shall show the death of the Lord until He come. Therefore, whosoever shall eat this bread, or drink the chalice of the Lord unworthily, shall be guilty of the body and of the blood of the Lord. But let a man prove himself, and so let him eat of that bread and drink of that chalice.*" (2 Cor. xi. 26-28, Rhem. version.)

It was, moreover, the view of the most eminent of the Fathers (I have room only for one or two of the greatest of them). *St. Chrysostom*, who was profoundly skilled in the Holy Scriptures, insists on the fact, that *there is no difference* between the priest and the people with respect to receiving the Eucharist. Thus (Homil. xviii. in 2 Cor.) he says, "*There are things wherein the priest differs nothing from the people; as when, for instance, we must use the awful mysteries (the Eucharistic elements); for we are all equally worthy of them. It is not now as it was under the old dispensation, when the priest ate some parts and the rulers others, and when it was not lawful for the people to partake of what the priests partook; but now one Body and one Cup are placed before all.*"

So also *St. Augustine* (Gratian's Decret. pars. 3, de Consecr. d. 2. c. 37, cum frangitur), thus writes, "*While the host is being broken, and the Blood from the cup is being poured into the mouths of the faithful, what else is signified but the immolation of the Lord's Body on the Cross, and the pouring out of the Blood from His side?*" Again (lib. iii. quæst. in Lev.); speaking of the Eucharist, as distinguished from the Jewish sacrifices, he says, "*Not only is no one hindered from taking the Blood of the sacrifice, but rather all, who ask to have life, are expected to drink of it.*"

If, then, it be true that there is not the slightest hint given by the Evangelists or *St. Paul* that our Lord designed any difference to exist, in this respect, between the apostles and Christians in general; and, moreover, if no such difference was recognised by the Catholic Church for many centuries, as I proved in my last letter, surely the onus lies upon the Romish apologist to *prove* that there is such a difference as to justify the practice of his Church. In other words, he is bound to give some *good reason* why the *words of institution, as regards the cup, are not to be considered as applying to the laity.*

I would observe next that the *withholding the cup deprives the communion of the very nature of a sacrament*, by destroying the analogy between the sign and the thing signified, which consists in the resemblance between the nourishment which bread and wine separately minister to our bodies, and the spiritual sustenance which Christ's body and blood minister to our souls,

"This sacrament," says St. Thomas Aquinas, "is ordained for spiritual refreshment, which is conformable to corporal. But for corporal refreshment two things are required—viz., food, which is dry aliment, and drink, which is liquid aliment; and, consequently, also, to the integrity of this sacrament two things concur, scil. spiritual food and spiritual drink."

[Hoc sacramentum ordinatur ad spiritualem refectionem quæ corporali conformatur. Ad corporalem autem refectionem duo requiruntur, scil. cibus, qui est alimentum siccum, et potus, qui est alimentum humidum. Et ideo etiam ad integritatem hujus sacramenti duo concurrunt, scil. spiritualis cibus et spiritualis potus. Thom. Aq. Summa, part 3., q. 73.]

And this is only following the repeated statements of Holy Scripture, which emphatically speaks of the body and blood *separately*, and in a way quite inconsistent with the idea that either comprehended the other, which the scholastic fiction of *concomitance* asserts without any Scriptural warrant whatever. For the body is represented as "*broken*" and the blood as "*shed*." (See St. Matt. xxvi., St. Mark xiv., St. Luke xxii., 1 Cor. xi.)

I would observe, further, that *the very nature of sacraments*, as positive ordinances deriving their efficacy from their divine institution, and from it alone, *prohibits any deviation from the original institution* except in cases where an exact conformity is either physically impossible, as *e.g.*, where no wine can be procured; or, for weighty reasons, unadvisable, *e.g.*, when the administering of wine to a sick person might be attended with dangerous consequences. In *extraordinary* cases of this kind we are justified in deviating from the strict letter of the institution, and may believe that, notwithstanding such deviation, the full spiritual benefits of the sacrament will be graciously vouchsafed by Him who "looketh not on the outward appearance, but on the heart." But what may be done or has been done on extraordinary occasions cannot justify the deliberate and unnecessary alteration of what are plainly the essential parts of a sacrament, when no unavoidable impediments to the exact performance of the rite exist. This was the view of the matter taken by the early Fathers. The words of St. Cyprian, especially, are so express and pertinent to the subject, that I shall make no apology for quoting them. *Cyprian*, speaking of the practice of using *water* instead of wine, which had been employed by a certain sect of Christians in his day, who thence were termed *Aquarii*, condemns it most severely. "Know," says he, "that we are admonished that, in offering the cup, the tradition of the Lord is to be observed, and that *nothing else should be done by us than what the Lord has first done for us*." [Epis. 63 ad Cœcilium.] And again, in the same epistle, he says, and, if possible, still more emphatically: "But if it be not lawful to break even the least of the Lord's commands, how much more is it unlawful [*fas non est*] to infringe such great ones, so sublime, so much appertaining to the very sacrament of our Lord's passion and our redemption, or to change it by human tradition into anything else but what was divinely instituted?"

I ask, therefore, did the Fathers at the Council of Constance know the most proper way of administering the Holy Eucharist better than our Lord Himself, who instituted it? or, to take

lower ground, but one equally binding on Catholics, and especially the upholders of Papal Infallibility, than St. Chrysostom, St. Augustine, St. Cyprian, or Popes Gelasius, Leo I., or Gregory the Great?—Yours obediently,
AN OLD CATHOLIC.

Extracted from the "Press and St. James's Chronicle," Jan. 22, 1876.

TO THE EDITOR.

SIR,—As I understand that you are about to republish in the form of a pamphlet, the correspondence between Lord Redesdale and Cardinal Manning, which has already appeared in your pages, and that you propose to pay me the compliment of adding my letters in an appendix, perhaps you will permit me to supplement what I have already written, by observing upon some authorities relied on by Cardinal Manning in his letter of the 3rd November last, of which I then omitted any notice, partly for the sake of brevity, and partly from not having had the necessary books at hand at the time.

I have since read carefully those authorities, and am more and more astounded at the bold contempt which the Cardinal feels for the amount of intelligence, or rather for the ignorance of his readers, in supposing that such cases could go unquestioned.

Let me take first the alleged authority of TERTULLIAN, whose works (at least those written before he became a Montanist heretic) are doubtless entitled to great respect. I first remark that the Cardinal omits giving any reference to the particular work of Tertullian, which he states to contain such evidence, while he, somewhat disingenuously, leads his readers into believing that he is quoting the evidence from Dr. Döllinger and on *his* authority. I have carefully read Dr. Döllinger's History of the Church, and positively assert that in no part of it does he refer to *Tertullian* as evidence, that even in domestic communion in times of persecution (when Christians were obliged to resort to the Catacombs, and such hiding places, to exercise any Christian rites) the faithful partook only of the consecrated bread.

The Cardinal next refers to a section in Rock's *Hierurgia*, in which, under the imposing title "Communion under One Kind of Apostolic Institution" (chap. 2, s. xi.), one might expect to find a host of testimonies, which the writer boasts that he *could* accumulate from Ecclesiastical History; but in this I can find little more than the stock cases of Serapion and Ambrose, which I have already dealt with in a previous letter, and which appear to have been, for want of better, the principal *chevaux de bataille* on the Romish side of the controversy ever since the days of Bishop Jewell and the Jesuit Harding; except an allusion to a passage from St. Gregory Nazianzen, in his funeral oration on his sister Gorgonia, which he prudently does not venture to give, for the plain reason (as was well exposed by Bishop Jewell more than three centuries ago) that it proves the very contrary of his assertion—(see Jewell's works by Jelf, Vol. I. p. 406), where he gives the passage thus:—"If her hand had laid up any portion of the tokens of the precious body *and of the blood*, mingling it with her tears" (σώματος και αἵματος). No wonder Rock omitted such a reference. Dr. Rock, indeed, quotes a passage from Tertullian's

letters to his wife (Ch. V.), in which, exhorting her against marrying again, or at least against marrying a Pagan husband, he uses the argument, "Will he not know what you taste in secret before any other food, and if he shall perceive bread, will he not believe it to be what it is called?" Which obviously proves no more that Communion in *bread* only was then usual, than another passage in Chapter VI. of the same letter, "Of whose *cup* will she partake?" proves that communion in *wine* only was then the custom. ["De Cujus poculo participabit?"]

The next authority relied on by the Cardinal is that of the Venerable BEDE's History of the Anglo-Saxon Church, in which he asserts that there are two cases of communion in one kind only, given in Chapters 14 and 24 of the Fourth Book.

These cases are shortly as follows :—

Chapter XIV. contains a story of a little Saxon boy in the monastery of Selsey on the coast of Sussex, founded by Bishop Wilfred, which Bede says he *heard* from Bishop Acca, who *said* it was *told him* by most creditable brothers of the same monastery. A grievous pestilence at the time prevailed through many parts of Britain, and this little boy was seized with the distemper, and confined to his bed. On the second day of fasting and praying, the most blessed princes of the Apostles St. Peter and St. Paul vouchsafed to appear to him, and saluting him in a most affectionate manner, said, "My child, do not fear death, about which you are so uneasy; for we will this day conduct you to the heavenly kingdom; but you are first to stay till masses are said, that having received the *body and blood* ('*viatico dominici corporis ac sanguinis accepto*') to support you on your journey, and being so discharged through sickness and death, you may be carried up to the everlasting joys in Heaven." They proceeded to announce to him that not one but himself in the monastery, nor any of its possessions, should die of this plague, and all that were then sick, except himself, should be restored to health, adding that this favour was vouchsafed to him by the Divine mercy at the intercession of King Oswald, who was this very day killed in war by the infidels, which proved afterwards to be the case. It is to be presumed that what the Apostles meant was, that this was the *anniversary* of King Oswald's death, as Bede goes on to say that the priest believed what the boy said, and going thence immediately looked into his chronicle, and found that King Oswald *had been* killed on that very day. "He then called the brethren, ordered dinner to be provided (!), masses to be said, and all of them to communicate *as usual*; causing also a part of the *Lord's oblation of the same sacrifice* to be carried to the sick boy," which, I may observe, must have been *both* of the *body and blood of our Lord*, or they would have disobeyed the positive injunction of the Holy Apostles so miraculously given immediately before. Bede goes on to relate, upon the same authority (rather a roundabout one, it must be admitted), that the boy died the same day, but no other person belonging to that monastery died at that time.

The story is sufficiently wonderful, no doubt; but there is one thing still more astonishing, that such a person as Cardinal Manning could have relied on such a story without having first read it, or that, having read it, he should have had the effrontery

to add to it the question, "Is it possible that *such facts* could be mentioned without reproof, if there were a Divine command to receive in both kinds? Objectors have to *disprove* these facts," &c., &c. Query—what fact? Is it the *fact* that St. Peter and St. Paul, in a vision, commanded the boy not to die until he had received the body *and blood* of our Lord, or that the monks of Selsey administered the *same* oblation to the dying boy? Can Cardinal Manning *prove* that the monks of Selsey disobeyed the express injunctions of the miraculous vision?

The second case from the 24th chapter is briefly as follows:—

There was in the monastery of St. Kilda, near Whitby, in Yorkshire, about A.D. 680, a brother named Cædmon, who seems to have spent his time chiefly in poetical exercises, and who, among other things, had turned into most harmonious verse the Book of Genesis and other parts of the Sacred Scriptures. This pious poet, really approaching his end, but when there appeared no sign of his dying soon, asked his brethren whether they had the Eucharist there? (*Afferte mihi Eucharistiam.*) Then, strengthening himself with the heavenly viaticum, he prepared for the entrance into another life (*sic-que se cœlesti muniens viatico vitæ alterius ingressui paravit*), whereupon he laid his head on the pillow and, falling into a slumber, ended his life in silence. By what process of reasoning or criticism, the Cardinal presumes to construe "*Eucharistia*" into Communion in one kind only (and that where there could be no case of *necessity* whatever, all living together in a monastery in England), it is difficult to imagine.

The only other semblance of an authority is an equally obscure and equivocal case narrated in the treatise of St. Cyprian *De Lapsis*, in which he tells a wonderful story of a woman who, when she attempted with unworthy hands to open her box or chest (*arcam suam*), in which was the Eucharist (*Domini Sanctum*) was terrified by a flame issuing from it.* What was the size or structure of this box, or what were its contents, vaguely described as "*Domini Sanctum*," we are left wholly ignorant.

There is no doubt (as the learned Baluze observes in a note to the passage) that "in the early days of the Church, when Christians lived amidst their *persecutors*, and exercised their Christian mysteries in secret, there was no safe or certain place in which the Eucharist could be shut up. Therefore it was distributed to the faithful by the ministers, and each carried his own part home that he might receive the communion." Whether in such cases both the body and blood were taken, as in the case already cited by me from St. Jerome, or the body only, is not, indeed, a matter of much moment, as all admit with Dr. Döllinger that "*Domestic Communion*, particularly in times of persecution, was of ordinary occurrence. So Anchorets in the wilderness partook only of the consecrated bread, and, as St. Basil says, their communion was not less holy, nor less perfect, than that received in the Church.

* I may observe, however, that it appears from about the same page of St. Cyprian *De Lapsis*, that the chalice was then administered to all the faithful. [*Ubi vero solemnibus adimpletis calicem diaconus offerre præsentibus cæpit.*]

To the sick, also, it was customary to administer only in the form of bread, for it would have been difficult to preserve the consecrated wine, particularly in hot climates, and to have avoided the danger of spilling."

These were obviously, however, as already stated, only the exceptional cases arising, out of the difficulty of the times, or the peculiar state or position of the communicant, and in no way normal cases, running side by side in all ages with Communion in both kinds, as contended by Cardinal Manning.

Whether it would not have been wiser in Cardinal Manning to have confined himself to his original text, that it is *treason and heresy* to appeal to history against the boasted Infallibility of his Church, instead of adventuring in his shallow skiff into the deep ocean of Ecclesiastical history in support of it, it will be for his admirers, not for me, to determine; but what is there which a vain man, and a Cardinal to boot, will not adventure to achieve, in a country like England, which is not yet alive to the bold and unscrupulous character of modern Ultramontaniam?—I am, Sir, your obedient servant,

AN OLD CATHOLIC.

January 20, 1876.



